

The Nation.

NEW YORK, THURSDAY, MAY 23, 1872.

The Week.

GREELY has not, we think, gained during the week at the North, though this is a point on which it would of course be absurd to speak with any confidence, the gain or loss of a candidate in popular estimation during any one week being too vague and ill-defined a thing to be weighed. But the sober second thought is, we believe, telling heavily against him among all the more influential friends of the Liberal Republican movement. The Springfield *Republican* and Chicago *Tribune* are the only two influential papers which were instrumental in getting up the Cincinnati movement which make even a pretence of warmth in supporting him, and we suspect in both cases it is done with much heaviness of heart and bitterness of spirit. We doubt if a single prominent originator of the movement will appear on the stump for him; and we venture to affirm that there is not one of them who does not regard his nomination as a national misfortune, of which we have yet to see the worst fruits. The question whether it is irretrievable, whether something cannot yet be done to carry out the true object of the Cincinnati Convention, and offer the country a candidate for whom all honest and conscientious men can vote with pride and respect, and a platform which all could understand and most men could adhere to, begins to be asked with a good deal of earnestness, and the *Evening Post* suggests a decided effort in that direction. There ought not to be any great difficulty in getting together a convention of forty or fifty representative men, who would do what it was hoped and believed the Cincinnati Convention would do. The helplessness with which at this moment all classes lie at the feet of a gang of wretched politicians, whom nobody respects or believes in, is most discreditable and disheartening; and we include under this characterization many of the Grant "workers" as well as those of Greeley.

But it must be confessed that without some violent interference with him, Greeley is pretty sure of a strong following at the South. All we see and hear of the state of Southern feeling goes to confirm the belief that Adams was the first choice of Southern men; that he would have carried the South triumphantly; that Greeley's nomination was received with surprise, but that it has gained favor, and is gaining favor every day since; and that in all probability the Southern white vote will have all but escaped completely from the control of the Baltimore Convention by the time that body meets, and that nothing but a display of unprecedented wisdom will save the Convention from having to accept Greeley as a necessity. There appears to be no doubt whatever that the Northern Democrats have completely lost the confidence of the Southern men, and that one of the regular Democratic nominations, such as Seymour's, would do Greeley little harm. He will be supported, if nothing better offers, by the better class of Southern whites, as a means of breaking up the existing party organizations, in the hope of securing the support of the Federal Government against the carpet-baggers; and by the old, virulent, and "unreconstructed rebels" as a means of bringing the Government into contempt and ridicule. They look on him as a ridiculous old fool, and for that reason will do their best to install him at the White House, as a bitter, revengeful joke. What the negroes will do appears to be still a mystery, but the chances seem to be that they will stand by the man with the soldiers.

There is also talk from Cincinnati of a renewed attempt on the part of the Reformers in that region to get before the public a candidate for the Presidency who shall either stand on the Missouri Platform, or, at all events, be a person who can reasonably be supposed to hold the opinions set forth in that document. They feel

that at present the Liberal Republicans are somewhat in the position of the Brahmin who, when preparing to sacrifice, had a mangy dog passed off on him by some unholy wags as a fine sheep, and who, having offered up the unclean beast, was smitten by the gods with disease in all his joints. To avoid an analogous fate, the disappointed brethren now propose to hold another Convention, or, in other words, to assemble once more in the Cave of Adullam. They have our best wishes, but we urge them to be sure this time, as one of our correspondents suggests, to have entire control of the Cave, and let nobody in whose antecedents and appearance do not inspire confidence. Readiness to sign papers is evidently no true test of trustworthiness.

Both the Republican and Democratic Conventions of this State have been held, and they seem to us to go far towards making the result at Philadelphia and at Baltimore sure. The Republican Convention was for Grant; the Democratic was, we take it, quite as decidedly for the Greeley and Brown ticket. Although there was, of course, a far greater degree of apparent unanimity among the Republicans than among the Democrats, it seems plain that the earnestness and confidence were to a great extent monopolized by the latter. We assure the President's confidential friends that these gentlemen certainly seem to think that they smell the offices—State and Federal, but especially the State offices. What other business was done in the Conventions besides giving each party delegation the required direction was of no importance. The Tweed wing of the Democracy are stated to be in good spirits.

Mr. Greeley has accepted the nomination in a letter which is mainly devoted to a reproduction of the Cincinnati Platform (as he understands it) in slightly altered phraseology. He agrees, with somewhat comical solemnity, to leave the mode of raising the revenue to the people, and, we are glad to see, declares himself in favor of the regular payment of the pensions of the soldiers and sailors. The depraved persons who have for years been trying to get those pensions stopped, must by this time be growing tired. Mr. Greeley also bids defiance to the Administration, believing that "in vain do the drill-sergeants of the decaying organizations flourish menacingly their truncheons, and angrily insist that the files shall be closed in and straightened; and in vain do the whippers-in of parties, once vital because rooted in the vital needs of the hour, protest against straying and bolting, and denounce men nowise their inferiors as traitors and renegades, and threaten them with infamy and ruin." We do not believe the "drill-sergeants" will wince or hide their "truncheons" before this. Mr. Greeley's English manifestly declines sadly when he is writing cautiously. His supporters ought to have got him into a towering rage before setting him down to prepare his answer, and then let him loose.

The members of Congress have no doubt been this week giving their earnest attention to politics, but Congress has been ostensibly busy, so far as the House is concerned, with the Tax and Tariff Bill, and, so far as the Senate is concerned, with the Ku-klux Bill. We give up the attempt to account for the tactics of the Administration senators. Whether their insolent domination for so long a period has blinded them to their real situation we do not know, but that would seem to be the likeliest explanation of their course. Their Ku-klux Bill no one can expect the House to pass. The representatives showed their state of mind very plainly when, the other day, they very emphatically stamped out General Butler's attempt to have a "recess" instead of an adjournment. This device—and, by the way, it is not so long ago since it would have been perfectly successful, and various gentlemen whom we could name would have been hurrahing for it—this device was intended to keep in force the present Ku-klux Act, which expires at the end of the session. Butler's

recess would have set the end of the session after the Presidential election. It was a sufficiently shallow scheme, but Mr. Conkling, Mr. Morton, and Mr. Edmunds appear to be not yet out of conceit of it. As for the House's action on the tariff, we may say in general that it was hasty, ignorant, and ill-considered, but that it shows the representatives to be at last awake to the fact that the country demands lower taxes, and that the bill, as got through the House by Mr. Dawes, is an immense improvement on the law as it stands. We suspect it is idle to hope that the Senate will make it into a law, yet it could do nothing more generally acceptable. The shipbuilding interest and the book-buying public have particular cause to be grateful to the House; but the bill as passed was a measure of general relief—estimated at \$45,000,000. The last forty pages of it, relating to internal taxes, were rushed through—there is no other term to use—with the utmost precipitancy and heedlessness. Mr. Dawes saw by a vote on an adjournment resolution that everybody was anxious to get home. Seeing this, and not being crazy with enthusiasm for the success of Mr. Conkling and Mr. Morton, and being desirous of getting his bill through, he proposed to the House to pass it in a lump, and the House actually did so.

The Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate have agreed by a majority of five to two to recommend the ratification of the supplemental article, with certain modifications of form designed to render it more palatable. There can be very little doubt that the ratification will take place. The pressure of the financial world in its favor is very strong, the imbroglio having thus far exercised a very serious influence on business, and the point in dispute being in itself in the highest degree ridiculous. The termination of the affair is not gratifying to the national self-love, but the final touch of absurdity is put to it by treating this termination as "a surrender to England." By the Treaty, as it will now stand, the United States gets (1) an apology; (2) the adoption, with retroactive effect, of three rules of international law which contain all she ever contended for in this controversy in the matter of neutral duties; and (3) the reference to arbitration under these rules of all claims for damages which any jurist of standing, native or foreign, has ever maintained had any solid foundation, or which in any court of law would receive five minutes' hearing. The "surrender to England" is very like a declaration on the part of a gentleman who has expressed, in a moment of heat, his intention of pulling an adversary's nose, of his willingness not to pull it in case the whole matter in controversy is left to the arbitration of a common friend. What should we say of a counsellor who should maintain that, his principal having once said he would pull the nose, he was bound—not to pull it, that would be undignified and absurd—but to persist in threatening to pull it until the arbitrator had rendered his decision, and to insist that the arbitrator should pass also on his right to pull it as part of the controversy, and who should fall to wailing and weeping over his friend's disgrace and overthrow because the latter had promised on reflection that he would not hereafter pull that nose or any other nose, the owner of which agreed reciprocally not to pull his nose! And yet we think boys are so silly and adults so wise.

We are assured by very good witnesses that Liberal Republicanism, or "Greeleyism," had nothing to do with General Hawley's defeat in the late senatorial contest in Connecticut; that personal devotion to Mr. Ferry played a large part in it. This was aided by the dislike of others than his personal friends to seeing an officer whose capacity, fidelity, and honesty no one questions turned out of his place merely for the sake of change and at the dictation of a caucus. But the fact remains that the Democrats have given practical proof of their willingness to act with any portion of the Republican party which chooses to revolt, and the importance of this fact it would be impossible to overrate, no matter by what name it is called. It, indeed, took three hours of severe

labor in caucus to bring over all the Democratic members to the support of Mr. Ferry; but most of the labor was expended on a very small minority—at the last upon one obstinate man, and he from a hopelessly Republican county—and the large majority at once, and without difficulty, showed themselves ready to do anything to win.

We advise people who have been throwing up their hats, white or colored, over this election to think once more before they ascribe it definitely to any one cause. The causes were several, and some of the most operative were strictly personal to Mr. Hawley, Mr. Ferry, Mr. English, Mr. Sperry, and other influential gentlemen, and have no significance outside of Connecticut, nor much important political significance inside of Connecticut, now that the election is past. Nevertheless, the original inventors of the scheme were Democrats little more friendly to Mr. Ferry than to Mr. Hawley, and not personally hostile to either, who feel that after years of defeat there is now a chance of victory. Then, again, the protest of President Woolsey and his friends against the caucus dictation is a sign which may be pondered with advantage. Clearly, revolt is in the air; and although we dare say Mr. Ferry is as much a Grant Republican as he is a Greeley Republican, and is not a Democrat at all, and although it is difficult to say just what the meaning of his election may be, it is a thing certain that party lines are breaking up. It is, by the way, rather curious to reflect that General Hawley might perhaps to-day have been in Mr. Ferry's place, and Mr. Ferry in his, had the General, at the beginning of the Cincinnati movement, put himself frankly on the Liberal Republican side. Personal reasons might have ensured his defeat; but, again, Democratic partisan reasons might well enough have overborne these. As it is, he has spent much good labor, and it is to his conscience alone that he can look for recompense.

It is an actual fact that the Hon. William M. Tweed will be a part of the tribunal which is to try the Hon. Judge McCunn for corrupt conduct in office. This, on the whole, is one of the most striking achievements of the Reform Legislature, and we request for it the attention of all kinds and conditions of men. We wish the pure-minded Greeley and Fenton man, and the incorruptible Conkling man, and, in general, all men who are warm partisans of any of the candidates who are to be voted for this year, would unite to tell us how valuable would be "a new deal" in this State and in the nation at large, it being provided that our new deal is to be made by our well-known old dealers on the one side or the other. In the proceedings against a judge whom it is sought to remove from the New York bench, it is requisite for success that a two-thirds majority should vote for the removal, and this majority must be a two-thirds majority of the full number of senators, and not of those who may happen to be present. The absence of a senator from his seat is, therefore, equivalent to a vote for acquittal, and Tweed, still a senator, is safe to be absent in a case of this kind, where for a wonder his room is quite as useful to the cause of rascality as his company used to be.

This is a striking but fair example of what it is in general that Fenton-Greeley Republicanism and Conkling-Murphy Republicanism have brought upon the State of New York, which last November had such fair hopes of relief and help. The whole wretched winter's work has been done just as certain other things have been done later in the year, that a faction in this State might get the better of another miserable faction. An "inside history" of the struggles of Conklingites to pass innocent emigration bills which would give them the control of railroads and enable them to influence the Presidential campaign; of Fentonites to get control of the speakership; of Conklingites to get control of the elections in this city; of Fentonites to screen the corrupt judges; of Conkling-

ites to save a bribed senator—an inside history of all these things, of which the public knows too little, would be of wonderful instruction and profit. Some member of the Bar Association should write it. In case McCunn and his friends are left on the bench, some of the members of that body will have to turn their attention to literature. Mr. Conkling may get his re-election as senator next winter, but we confess we shall live in hope.

They have been having a terrible time in England over the Athanasian Creed, with which few American Christians are familiar, and which may be briefly characterized by saying that it consigns to everlasting damnation, article by article, all persons who fail or neglect or refuse to believe a long string of propositions about the Trinity which, as the *Spectator* says, "no two of those who defend them understand in the same sense," and which no clergyman now ventures to teach his flock. The Creed has long been an offence to the laity of the Established Church, a reproach and absurdity in the eyes of the Dissenters, so a desperate attempt has been made to have it at least revised. In the Convocation of the Irish Church, which since the disestablishment, as in the American Church, contains a lay representation, the revision was carried by a majority of 192 to 106, 67 clergymen and 125 laymen voting aye, and 80 clergymen and 26 laymen voting no. In the Convocation of the English Province of Canterbury, no laymen being present, a similar proposition has been rejected by a vote of 62 to 7, Dean Stanley contending for revision eloquently, but almost alone. Some of the arguments used in defence of the Creed were in the highest degree diverting. One minister said the Duke of Wellington, who was a far higher authority than Lord Palmerston, had, "after a careful examination," satisfied himself that the Creed contained the true Christian doctrine.

The Woman's Rights movement, which a year ago seemed to enjoy a fair prospect of success in England, has just received a terrible blow in the House of Commons by the defeat of Mr. Jacob Bright's bill for extending the suffrage to female householders. It was lost by a majority of 222 to 143. This is not a very formidable majority on the surface, though greater than that of last year, which was only 63, but it is formidable in reality, inasmuch as it contains some prominent men who voted for the bill last year, but confess they are now sorry and disgusted, and a large number of distinguished Liberals, who, if the movement were making any progress, would by this time be won over. Moreover, the debate showed that the matter had lost all seriousness in the eyes of both friends and foes, both treating it very much as a huge joke, the public out-of-doors apparently taking little interest in it, the women even less than the men. This reaction is due somewhat to the reform movement, or desire of change, generally having lost much of its force; but in the main to further consideration of the real character and probable consequences of such a revolution as female suffrage, even in the modified shape in which it is presented in England, would work. One argument which seems to have had a good deal of weight is that it will never do to make it possible to separate the preponderance of physical force from the majority in numbers, which would be the case if the women, who are in nearly every state a majority, should pass any measure over the heads of the men. Considerable influence adverse to the bill has also been exerted by the experience the community has had of the performances of even the very clever and very well-meaning Englishwomen who have already plunged into politics in advance of the suffrage. No Woodhull has appeared amongst them, and yet their methods, manners, and spirit seem to have shocked the public considerably and to have repelled large numbers of their own friends.

The temperance men in England have been making a desperate effort for some time past to get what they call a Permissive Bill passed, giving the majority of ratepayers in each parish the right to

prohibit the sale of liquors absolutely within its limits. The bill has been killed, mainly on the ground that it would be wrong to allow the majority in any one parish to prohibit the doing of things permissible elsewhere, and which the legislature, by refusing to prohibit them generally, clearly considered neither good nor bad, but indifferent. But the debate produced a speech from Mr. Healey full of curious and instructive statistics, in which he showed conclusively, and contrary to all received opinion, that the number of public-houses in a place has no necessary connection with the amount of drunkenness in it, which seems to depend on a variety of other considerations. For instance, a poor neighborhood will be a drunken one, no matter how few the taverns; so will a neighborhood inhabited by the men of certain exhausting trades; so will an Irish neighborhood. All this goes to show that there is no middle course between permission and prohibition.

The most interesting question of French politics at this moment is the proposal made by the Government to revive the "Council of State," one of the most efficient and famous pieces of despotic machinery. The Assembly agreed to revive it, but wishes to elect the twenty-eight members itself, while M. Thiers wishes to appoint them all, but to this the Assembly has by a small majority refused to consent, and the Executive accordingly is once more, as the French say, *en délicesse* with the Legislature, but the latter will probably give way. The Council of State, under the Empire, drafted all the laws submitted to the Corps Législatif, gave or withheld—in practice always withheld—the permission to sue public functionaries, controlled absolutely the conduct of the prefects, and indeed the whole internal administration, and was, to all intents and purposes, the private council of a despotic monarch. No institution in Anglo-Saxon political history can be compared to it except the Star Chamber, which it resembles also in forming in certain cases a court of last resort. Should M. Thiers carry his point, and appoint its members, the farce of calling the French Government republican would have received its finishing touch; and what is most curious in the debates is that Gambetta and his friends heartily support the Executive. They hope to get into power yet themselves; and the more absolutist tools they find ready to hand, the better they will be pleased. The Assembly has passed laws prohibiting public meetings; the police arrest on political grounds wholesale and ransack houses on mere suspicion; newspapers are suppressed and punished with greater arbitrariness and severity than under the Empire; there is no *habeas corpus*, no decentralization, no freedom of speech; and all the tendencies of legislation and opinion are apparently in the other direction; and yet, as long as "the chief of the state" is not called a king, the Radicals are perfectly happy.

Marshal Bazaine, after much investigation, is awaiting his trial by court-martial for his conduct in surrendering Metz and the Army of the Rhine. By way of stemming the tide of public opinion, however, which runs strongly against him, he has published a book giving his own version of the affair, which, whatever it may do for him morally, is likely to damn him politically, if not legally, as it reproduces the document from his pen in which he gave the reasons which led him to offer to capitulate in case he were allowed to preserve the army, and these were none other than that the army was necessary to "save France from herself," or, in other words, to restore "order." This took very much the form of an appeal to German forbearance, and acknowledged his incapacity for further resistance, and, in short, after Bismarck had seen it—and he *did* see it—made the surrender at discretion only a question of time. The book goes far to justify the charge made against Bazaine of having been influenced in his strategy by "dynastic considerations," and will thus probably ruin him, though it is but just to remember that he had no communication with the Government of Paris or of Tours, both of which, at the distance of Metz, must have seemed utterly absurd and contemptible.

FOR WHOM SHOULD ONE VOTE?

WE publish elsewhere a letter which gives utterance to a doubt into which the performances of the Cincinnati Convention have plunged thousands of voters all over the country. We do not flatter ourselves that we are competent to remove it, and hardly feel called upon to institute a formal comparison between General Grant and Mr. Greeley until they are both fairly in the field as opposing candidates. But it is not by any means too early to consider Mr. Greeley's absolute fitness for the office to which he aspires. Whether he is more or less fit to be President than somebody else is one question, which is hardly yet ripe for discussion. Whether he can fairly be considered fit at all is another, which he and the Convention which nominated him are vehemently asking the public to discuss now. On this point there is a great deal to be said, and unfortunately nearly everything that is said on such a subject must be personal, and must, because personal, look somewhat rancorous. But there is no escape from it. A candidate for the Presidency, when he accepts the nomination, challenges every species of investigation, and agrees not to get angry, no matter how far it is pushed.

What Carl Schurz said at the Convention—that "anybody to beat Grant" was not the watchword which called it together—was perfectly true. We took the liberty before it met of warning it that the country would not be satisfied with a mere change of Administration; that in order to get it to repudiate Grant, something not only confessedly better than Grant, but plainly good, would have to be provided to take his place; that the gentlemen who went there would have to go there for some better purpose than "to win."

Now, we think the first disappointment experienced by those who looked for anything in the shape of reform from the Cincinnati Convention came from the early and outspoken declaration of many of the "managers," that "they came there to win" and for nothing else, and were ready to swallow any platform or accept any candidate that seemed likely to render most efficient service in defeating the Administration. What was to follow the defeat of the Administration was something about which they apparently gave themselves no concern. The steady preaching of this doctrine did much—nay, did more than anything else to prepare the way for Mr. Greeley's nomination. What was said in his favor oftener than anything else was that he would secure more support from the Democrats, and carry off more votes from the Republicans, than any other person recommended to the Convention. No attempt was made to promise in his behalf any serious or marked improvement in the conduct of the Government, more wisdom in council or vigor in action. That his methods would be purer or his ends loftier, nobody, so far as we know, ventured to assert at the Convention, and nobody, as far as we have seen, has ventured to assert since the Convention. We hear a good deal about his hold on "the people" in the country districts, about his popularity among the negroes, about the likelihood that the Democrats will endorse his nomination, about the warmth of his heart, the bigness of his brains, his love of agriculture, his extraordinary success in life, and his singular independence of character, and about the manly oddity of his clothes; but none of his friends say anything or say much about the policy he will pursue, the councillors he will call around him, or the changes he will introduce into the Administration. The *Springfield Republican* has indeed given a sort of hint that he will offer places in his Cabinet to Mr. Adams and Mr. Trumbull; but this, we suspect, was a purely gratuitous suggestion, and one, for reasons we shall give hereafter, unlikely to be adopted.

We can only think of two reasons which seem to us strong enough to induce any honest man to vote for Greeley. One is that his election would break up what we believe to be the thoroughly corrupt and time-serving Ring which has for some time past been managing the present Administration, and which, by connecting itself in the popular mind with "the results of the war," and by playing on General Grant's ignorance of affairs and desire for re-election, has made it all but impossible to turn the virtue and intelligence

which exist in the Republican party to any account for purposes of general reform. By steadily preaching the horrors that will ensue from any renewed participation of Democrats in the management of affairs, they have managed to get the mind of the public into a purely suspicious and defensive attitude, which makes all demands for change or improvement, or even investigation, wear the appearance of treason, and which, by maintaining and prolonging some of the precautionary measures growing out of the war, threatens to introduce into the very structure of the Government, and into the political habits of the people, dangerous and even fatal modifications. Greeley's election would put an end to this state of things. It would release the public mind from what we may call the military spell, and, by clearing the political field of the existing organizations, would call into activity once more the old American idea that improvement, and not preservation simply, is the proper work of Government, and that no improvement can be thorough or enduring on which the whole people have not had their say, and have not taken an untrammelled part either in supporting or opposing.

This leads us to the second reason, which is, that as Greeley's election is only possible by a combination of Republicans and Democrats, it would operate as a veritable burying of the issues of the war, and the release of the Democratic party from the old pro-slavery traditions, or, in other words, its extinction as a political organization, and would bring the South back again into cordial political relations with the North; which, every one must see, is a condition of all real national progress. It would put an end to the sectional divisions which have for the last thirty years been the curse of American politics, and would make it possible for Massachusetts and South Carolina to act together once more on national questions. We have been so long accustomed to look on harmony of this sort as necessarily the result of some base compliance or sacrifice of principle on one side or the other, that it is difficult to get men to think of it as under any circumstances a blessing; and yet a blessing it would be, and one of the greatest that could descend upon the country. If Greeley's election helped us to it, we should so far gain by Greeley's election.

It will thus be seen that our gains from Greeley's success would be to our mind wholly indirect and incidental. They would be gains to which Greeley's character or capacity would contribute nothing whatever. He would play the part in the matter of a natural agent clearing the air of pestilential vapors. Anybody else whom a combination such as would elect him could be induced to put in Grant's place, would serve the purpose equally well. When we come to consider him by himself, as a man or politician, with opinions, powers, antecedents, we know of nothing to entitle him to the place for which he now aspires, and we should look on his election as likely to do good only on the theory that no radical improvement can be looked for until things have reached their worst. We think there is a fair chance that by making the bad ridiculous as well as intolerable, he would create a reaction that would initiate an upward movement. It may be that four years of Greeley is a necessary preparation for an era of statesmanship, dignity, and decency; but we confess we have a profound distrust of the theory that you must get to the bottom in politics before you can hope to begin to ascend; that plan has been pretty thoroughly tried in this city and State, and we know with what result. We let things go down here till we had apparently reached the lowest depth. We then found that the healthy public hatred of wrong, and public shame at the sight of wrong, were so eaten away by long use that it was with difficulty that even Cardozo and Barnard were brought to trial; that we could not secure the expulsion of even Tweed and Fields from the Legislature; and that even the "Reform Legislature," which was elected in what was supposed to be a storm of popular indignation, proved to be a body which the *Tribune* described in this way (all other respectable papers concurring) on its adjournment:

"A large and corrupt lobby has been actively at work throughout the winter and spring, and current opinion is very much out of the way if nearly half the men who pretend to serve the State for three dollars a day have not hand-ed

more or less money which came from other sources than the Treasury. This is plain truth, and it ought to shame those constituencies who are content to be represented here year after year by men alike destitute of character, talent, and honorable ambition. The absence of this latter quality is one of the most deplorable signs of the disease which infects both State and nation. It is high time the honest citizens of the Empire State realized the disgraceful and perilous position in which they are placed by a stupid and almost universal indifference to local politics. It is not here asserted that the present Legislature is absolutely more corrupt than its predecessors, but, if it fairly represents the character of the people, then the Republic has seen its best days."

Now what bearing has this on Greeley? Do we mean to compare "Honest Horace" to "Bill Tweed" and "Tom Fields"? By no means. We have already done full justice to the good there is in Greeley's character and career. In the position which he has occupied for thirty years, it is not possible for any man to belittle him or degrade him. He has played a leading part in one of the greatest philanthropic movements of the age; he has founded a great newspaper possessing enormous influence; and has induced a large body of his countrymen to admire and love him. He has many able and honest men now supporting him. But his election to the Presidency would none the less, in our opinion, be the triumph of the combined forces of corruption and folly. Our firm belief is that there is not a political knave in the Union who has failed to get what he wants from Grant who is not at this moment "working" for Greeley heart and soul, and for obvious reasons. There are probably not ten per cent. of his supporters who expect good government from him on his own motion. What they look for at his hands are facilities for attaining their own ends through some one or other of his many weaknesses. That worthless men would surround him, influence, deceive, and use him, is a legitimate deduction from his whole career which worthless men have not been slow in drawing. That he would take into his councils men of mark, and weight, and character is a presumption which that same career goes far to rebut. His vanity and love of flattery, his confidence in his own opinions, and his childlike brutality in asserting them, would disincline him to draw about him those who would consider themselves, and whom he would suspect of considering themselves, his superiors; or, if he did, would make it well-nigh impossible for them to act harmoniously with him. With his habits of mind and his opinion of the value of his own ideas, it is difficult to conceive of his allowing his judgment to be affected by what any man in the nation could say to him on any public question. What confusion and uncertainty this would foreshadow, one can hardly conjure up without recalling the multitude of wild, startling, and utterly absurd opinions which he has during the past thirty years upheld with the greatest vehemence.

But the strongest objection to him is that he is, as a Presidential candidate, the final attempt of that large class of quacks, charlatans, ignoramuses, and sentimentalists who are engaged in every civilized country to-day in trying to substitute "the heart" for the head—or, in other words, to make singing, weeping, and wailing do in politics the work of memory and judgment—to get possession of the government of the United States. They have succeeded in ruining one great and noble nation; their fondest desire and proudest hope is now to ruin this. They attain their ends by steady war on nearly all the methods, practices, principles, and ideas which have raised man from the condition of a naked savage to that of a civilized citizen of a free state. They have no faith in any training; they despise all education beyond what fits a man to read their own speeches and articles; they treat the experience of the human race as a mere collection of fables; they delight in the abasement and overthrow and destruction of everything that most stimulates human endeavor in the way of honor or reward. Their ideal of human society is one in which there reigns the equality of the herd on the prairie, in which a life of instinct is passed under the partial guardianship of a few noisy old bulls, whose sole duty to the state is to bellow. We should be sorry to see them installed in Washington, playing tricks with the great fabric which has thus far defied them, which, "defended by reverence, defended by law, a fortress at once and a temple," and resting on the solid rock of po-

pular common sense, it is not in their power to bring to naught, but which they might sadly deface, and might even for a brief period bring into contempt.

WORKINGMEN'S LEISURE.

WE are witnessing in this city what we may consider the final triumph of what is called "the eight-hour system" in all or nearly all the trades, and this without compromise of any kind: that is, without either reduction of wages, or division of the day into hours, or payment by the hour. Owing to the fact that the summer is the busy season for building, house-carpentering, painting, and so on, the mechanics have for a long while past made a practice of waiting till the bosses had made their contracts, and then striking for an advance of wages. Resistance under these circumstances would, to many employers, be total ruin; so the men have almost invariably carried their point. This year they have struck, and with unusual unanimity—not for an advance of wages, but for a reduction in the hours of labor without a reduction in wages—and the bosses have again yielded, but not without publishing a melancholy and unavailing protest. The press, they say, panders to the workingmen's indolence and unscrupulousness: so do the politicians. The Government has, without a particle of justification, introduced the eight-hour system into its arsenals and workshops, thus throwing its weight into the scale against private employers; and the men of business with whom builders and carpenters have contracts refuse to make any concessions as regards time. There is, therefore, nothing left to employers but to submit. They cannot submit, they say, without serious loss. They deny utterly the correctness of the current notion that the average workman will do as much in eight hours as in ten, and laugh at the idea that he will turn the two hours of leisure to good account in self-improvement. They maintain that he will, on the contrary, at best pass them in loafing, and, in a large majority of cases, pass them in drinking or some other form of vice. Moreover, they add that even if he did do as much in eight hours as in ten, in the large shops, where there is a heavy investment of capital in machinery, a diminution of two hours in the day's labor means a loss of twenty per cent. in the return on the investment.

The first and most marked effect—the only one, indeed, which for some time will be sensible of this movement—will be a retardation of the growth of New York. The city, as everybody knows, has been for the last ten years falling back in the race in which it has ever since the opening of the canals distanced all competitors. Year by year, down to 1860, it steadily drew off their commerce from Boston, Philadelphia, and Baltimore. Since 1860, it has not grown in the same ratio. Indeed, it has only held its own by submitting to inconveniences in the shape of dirt, and defective house accommodation and sanitary arrangements, to which other cities did not expose themselves, and by the accumulation of an enormous debt, which enabled it temporarily to keep down the taxation, and, though last not least, by having been the first city to become possessed of a fine park, which made it very attractive as a place of residence to people of large fortune. But these devices have not been sufficient to prevent manufacturers from stealing away to a greater or less extent, or to prevent the partial transfer of some branches of commerce to Boston and Philadelphia and Baltimore, and, above all, to drive out into the country districts and into New Jersey, in greater and greater numbers every year, that large middle class on which, rather than on the very poor or very rich, every city must rely in the main for its growth and prosperity. These losses are, of course, not the result of any one cause. The thefts of the Ring and other abuses of the municipal government have had much to do with them, but the cost of living in New York has much to do also, and this cost is of course greatly increased by the inefficiency of labor in all branches. Printing, to take one instance, is, we believe, done where the nature of the work will permit, more cheaply out of New York than in it, and furniture costs less out of New York than in it. Houses of course have to be built by New York mechan-

nies, but once it becomes well settled that capitalists are at the mercy of New York mechanics, and that these are not troubled with scruples or industry, people will more and more prefer building their houses elsewhere.

It may be asked, however, whether the reduction of the day's labor to eight hours is not, on the whole, a good thing, and cheaply bought, should it become general, by the decline of any or all great cities; whether the intellectual or moral improvement of the workingman is not a consideration superior to all considerations of pecuniary profit or loss? This is a serious and important question, and it is one on which there is so much wild talk that it can hardly receive too much attention. Whether the shortening of the hours of his labor is a benefit to a man or not, depends partly on the means by which the shortening is procured and partly on the man's own character. In the not very encouraging account given the other day, by the commandant of the Rock Island Arsenal, of the result of the eight-hour system there, it appeared that the extent to which the men turned their increased leisure to good account depended on their moral and mental training. The higher classes of mechanics profited by it; the masons did so to some extent; but to the common laborers it was simply a source of injury both to health and morals. Therefore, before we can tell whether a man's condition is likely to be improved by having his day's work shortened, we have to find out what kind of man he is; and if we test the value of the success of the movement in this city in this way, we fear the prospect will not be found to be very cheering. The great body of the younger mechanics who are foremost in the agitation have not received the kind of training, and are not in the state of mind, to make them very likely to use the newly-acquired two hours for their own real benefit. The present writer had occasion, a few months ago, to witness the working of two elderly carpenters, bred in the old American school, on a very nice job, side by side with two younger ones of the new, noisy, rhetorical, agitating school. The seniors were model workmen, faithful, punctual, and industrious, although working under a boss's contract, at a distance from the shop; and keenly interested in their work, and sensitive to the last degree about its excellence. The juniors came an hour later than they every day, and went off to the nearest grocery every day, some days as many as five times, to get drinks, and were invariably fretful and querulous, disgusted with the job, and anxious to quit it when it presented difficulties which only seemed to rouse the older men's ardor. On enquiry, we found that the latter belonged to no union, never had, cared nothing about the eight-hour movement, and did not believe any first-class carpenters were in it; while the juniors were apparently leaders.

Now, we think it may be laid down as a rule, that repose which a man extorts or gets for nothing is, if not hurtful, of little benefit to him. Inherited leisure is generally a curse, which only strong characters can escape, and so is leisure won by gambling or lucky speculation. "Well-won repose," as it is called—that is, the repose earned by hard work, or taken, as the vacation of most workers with the brain is taken, simply as a means of qualifying one's self to work more effectively thereafter—is, indeed, on the whole, the only repose by which the race has gained anything. If the workingmen sought leisure for these reasons and in this spirit, society would undoubtedly gain by their having it, and so would they themselves. If, for instance, carpenters were as deeply interested in carpentry, or masons in masonry, as lawyers are in the law, doctors in medicine, and ministers in the ministry, and longed to excel in it and perfect themselves in it more and more, it would not be possible to lengthen their evenings and diminish their purely muscular toil by two hours without greatly increasing their power of doing good, honest work. They would use their leisure to perfect themselves in one way or another in their trades. But if it be true, as we believe it is, that the great body of those engaged in this movement look on their callings as simply repulsive forms of toil, to which stern necessity compels them to submit, but which every man is justified in escaping by any means within his reach, and in putting out of his mind

as well as out of his sight as soon as he lays down his tools, it would be very rash to look for any better results from it than a diminution of production, a transfer of industry to other places, and an increase of extravagance, drinking, and other forms of demoralization among the workingmen.

In fact, we have no hope that the eight-hour system will be of any value to the workingmen, except under the co-operative system. As long as it comes in the form of a victory won over the greedy bosses, with huzzas and waving of hats, it cannot do permanent good. When it comes by the deliberate resolution of the men themselves, after mature consideration of what it will cost *them* in production, and with full knowledge that it will cost them something—as it *would* come if it came through the vote of a co-operative society—it is pretty sure to result in better work, better health, better morals, and greater happiness. No man who sees these wretched conflicts between labor and capital called strikes in their true light, can hope for any good to the laborer to result from them except increased skill in combination. To suppose that the laboring class can make real moral and mental progress as long as it looks on the daily work of its hands not as one of the social functions and its contribution to the general civilization, but as a sort of exaction inflicted by another hostile and selfish class, which it is lawful to evade as one would the demands of a robber or a slaveholder—is to suppose something for which nothing in human nature affords any warrant. If education has lost its power of making men faithful in the discharge of their daily duties, self-interest must be called in to do the work.

THE EXPERIENCE OF A PUBLIC LIBRARY.

I.

AT a club dinner in Boston not long since, at which the company was made up of middle-aged professional men, men of business, and *littérateurs*, most of whom were Harvard graduates, the conversation turned upon the current literature of the day. The popularity of various authors was incidentally discussed, when suddenly one of those present, who had taken a prominent part in the management of the Boston Public Library, rather startled the rest of the company by intimating a decided doubt whether any person then present could give the names of any one of the three most popular authors of the day. In saying this, he explained that by the expression "most popular authors of the day" he meant those for whose works the most frequent and eager demand existed at the desks of the public libraries. The challenge was rather derisively accepted, and the most familiar names in our literature, from Shakespeare down to Tupper, were one after another mentioned. After each had been met by a more or less decided negative, those present were duly impressed with a becoming sense of their own ignorance by the information that, judged by the standard referred to, Mrs. Southworth, Caroline Lee Hentz, and Maria J. Holmes stood at the head of all those who ever had written or now were writing in the English tongue.

To those best calculated to judge, and who have any acquaintance with the works of these gifted authors, such a statement may not appear very encouraging; it is, nevertheless, decidedly suggestive. If nothing more, it at least shows what a vast capacity for improvement as regards literature must exist in the average American mind even in the most generally educated parts of the country. And yet it would hardly be safe to draw too decided an inference from such a fact as here stated. It is to be remembered that, while some books are bought which are not read, very many books are read which are not bought. There be books and books—books, as Charles Lamb said, which are not books, and books which no gentleman's library *should* be without, and yet again books which no circulating library *can* be without. Now the works of Mrs. Southworth and of Mrs. Hentz may well belong to the class last referred to; it may well be that they are immensely sought for at the desk of a city library which may contain twenty dilapidated duplicates of them, not one of which is allowed to rest twenty-four hours on its shelf; and yet the class of readers from whom this demand originates probably are not the book-buying class. After all, the true test of popularity in authors is not found among readers of this class. It is and always will be evidenced by the dog-eared volumes of Shakespeare, or Bunyan, or Defoe, or Dickens, which turn up generation after generation in houses where no writer of the day ever penetrates. Where the works of Mrs. Southworth and of Mrs. Hentz do go, other and better books can be made to go, and to make them go there and thus get control of this potent engine of popular education, is the

real mission of public libraries. These are indeed the necessary complement to our system of common-school education, and now that they have ceased to be an experiment—now that in many cities and towns, especially in Massachusetts, libraries which ten years ago were beyond the reach of the best educated of their citizens are thrown open to every inhabitant—the single wonder is that such an indispensable concomitant to any tolerable popular education should have been forced to await its development in our times. Through this agency, in fact, we are only just now beginning to popularize literature. The experience of one community as regards these institutions will probably be found to be the experience of all, and the subject is yet sufficiently novel to give it a general interest. We propose to take a New England suburban town, in no respect apparently different from most others, and say something of its experiment with a public library, as showing what a New England community reads and how as yet it reads it.

The town of X. is situated in the vicinity of Boston, and contains, scattered more or less densely over rather large territorial limits, a population of about 7,500 souls. They are mainly native Americans and Irish, while the occupations of the inhabitants, except in so far as they are workers in stores, in no respect differ from those of the residents of any other large town in close proximity to a great city. A movement in favor of a public library was organized in X. in the spring of 1871, and by midsummer the necessary amount, \$5,000, had been raised, half by public and half by private subscription. It took a longer time to procure this small sum, as the persons having the matter in charge deemed it very expedient that those for whose benefit the library was intended should feel that they had contributed to it, and so, declining to allow a few wealthy persons to make up the amount by large subscriptions, the town was districted and actively canvassed until the necessary sum was contributed in amounts ranging from ten cents upwards, but only in a single case exceeding fifty dollars. A suitable library room was offered free of charge by the liberality of a seminary established in the town.

The issue of cards upon which books could be borrowed free from the library began on December 11. Every inhabitant of the town over fourteen years of age was entitled to one of these cards, upon registering his name and address, and at the end of six weeks 1,320 cards had been issued, upon which over 7,000 volumes had been borrowed from the library. This was an average of nearly 200 volumes a day, and afforded some indication of the intellectual famine which must previously have existed. At the end of five months the number of cards issued had increased to 1,750, while 24,000 volumes had been borrowed upon them. Of this great number no book had been lost, and only one bore marks of having been intentionally mutilated. Saturday evening was uniformly the busiest of the week, when, not uncommonly, the library room would be oppressively crowded with persons of both sexes and all ages waiting for their books, giving the two young women who constituted the entire librarian force of the institution all and more than they could attend to. Sometimes as many as one hundred persons would be waiting at once, and the number of books delivered in any one day has even exceeded four hundred.

What are these books? What is the class of literature in such great demand? At first blush the answer to this question is a little startling—perhaps even somewhat calculated to appall. Of every hundred books taken out there will, upon an average, be 45 works of fiction for adults, 35 of fiction for juveniles, and 20 volumes of every other description of literature. This library does not happen to contain the works of either Mrs. Southworth or of Mrs. Hentz, which would undoubtedly be in as great demand here as they are found to be at the City Library in Boston. Meanwhile, in their absence, the three writers whose works are most eagerly sought are Mrs. Stowe, Mrs. Whitney, and Miss Alcott, while the most frequently read books are "Uncle Tom's Cabin," Miss Cummings's "Lamplighter," and, strange to say, side by side with "We Girls" and "Little Men," and in close competition with these modern favorites, come the literary offspring of good old Misses Roche and Porter—"The Children of the Abbey," "Thaddeus of Warsaw," and the "Scottish Chiefs." Meanwhile the great Sir Walter, the world-renowned contemporary of the last-named two excellent ladies, lingers far behind them in popular appreciation; he is, in fact, clean distanced in the running. At first he could not be forced upon the market at all, and the modern boy even seemed to have lost all relish for "Ivanhoe." Of late, however, the public has given signs of an improved education, and Sir Walter is looming up in the distance, ranking, perhaps, among favorites of the third or fourth class.

Indeed, if the writers of fiction in most popular demand were to be roughly classified, it would be somewhat as follows: In the first class, after the various chief favorites already mentioned, would come Mayne Reid, Charles Reade, Dickens, Cooper, Charlotte Brontë, A. S. Roe, Miss Muloch, Wilkie Collins, M. J. Holmes, T. S. Arthur, and, pleasant to add, good old

Miss Austen. The works of these writers, and a few miscellaneous favorites, such as "Robinson Crusoe," "The Arabian Nights," and "Gulliver's Travels," are almost never on the shelves; as the copies are read to pieces they are replaced by others, but the demand does not stop. In the second class, popular, but not nearly so popular, would come Marryat, Disraeli, Anthony Trollope, Lever, Dumas, Hawthorne, Bulwer, Thackeray, Mrs. Charles, Mrs. Walker, Miss Douglas, Walter Scott, Miss Kavanagh, and Miss Edgeworth. It is useless to go into details as to the works of the authors thus miscellaneous jumbled together; it may be enough to say of the three probably greatest masters of contemporary English fiction, that the "Old Curiosity Shop" is the favorite among the productions of Dickens; that not many books are more read than the "Scarlet Letter"; and that Thackeray is confined to a comparatively limited circle, which is chiefly addicted to "Vanity Fair." One little circumstance connected with the circulation of Thackeray's works would, however, have excited the most intense humorous gratification in the mind of that gentleman could it but have come to his knowledge. A very considerable demand for all books upon Ireland, or Irish subjects, exists among the foreign-born citizens of the town. From the life of St. Patrick to the stories of Gerald Griffin and Charles Lever, and beyond these to the ballads of Ireland and the memoirs of Sir Jonah Barrington, nothing comes amiss. Into this category the "Irish Sketch-Book" and, better yet, the famous "Luck of Barry Lyndon" have found their way, and of all possible Saxons Thackeray enjoys a species of Celtic vogue as a chronicler of Ireland's fame and a depicter of Irish character.

There is not much to say on the subject of juvenile fiction. Oliver Optic, Mayne Reid, Baker, and Kingston occupy the field, and their productions, as they seem to satisfy all youth indiscriminately, leave the critic of a public library in much the same situation, so far as food for reflection is concerned, that he would be in as regards adults did they all demand Victor Hugo or Charles Reade, and were all equally satisfied therewith.

Such is eighty per cent. of the literature which goes out of the institution; and, upon the whole, can it be said that it is otherwise than a healthy average? That the appetite is a natural one no one can deny, for the first intellectual demand of human beings, whether in the infancy of the race or of the individual, is for the story-teller. Homer was only the most popular and brilliant story-teller of the Greeks; the Book of Ruth was evidently regarded as the choicest novelette in Hebrew literature; the Arabian Nights are as old probably as the Koran. A certain class of sentimental and professional philanthropists love to depict the son of toil, as they designate him, returning from his legal day's work of eight hours, eager to revel in some treatise on political economy, or, perhaps, the correlation of forces. One workingman in fifty may indeed be equal to that heroic treatment; but it is the business of public libraries to supply the world as it is, and the two in a hundred do not constitute the world. A few giants among toiling men—George Stephenson, for instance (whose biography, by the way, is far less read than it might be)—a few like Stephenson are equal to an evening's work with the brain succeeding a day's work with the muscles; well, it is the special vocation and pride of the public library to supply every man who has a glimmering of Stephenson's power and ambition with everything in the way of books that money can buy. Having done this for the two in the hundred, and practically for these two alone, it seems but right that the weaker brothers and sisters, who, after all, do and must exist, and who are and will comprise the vast majority of the race—it seems but right that these should be gratified in their taste for story-telling, and through it for amusement and distraction of mind, even though their taste does incline to nutriment of a rather feeble character. That as many as one book in five is of a solid or useful character should be the true subject of surprise, and probably so high an average could be found nowhere out of New England, at least in America.

ENGLAND.

LONDON, May 3, 1872.

IT is sometimes said, I know not with what truth, that women are likely to obtain the right of voting in England sooner than in the United States. Certainly any one who had been present at the meeting held in St. George's Hall on Monday last would have been inclined to augur favorably of their prospects. Not only was the room so crowded that many speakers had difficulty in obtaining admission, but the overflow was so great that a second meeting was improvised at some other rooms in the neighborhood. The eloquence was of the most enthusiastic kind, and all the stock arguments were applauded to the echo. I shall not attempt to philosophize upon the causes of this vigorous agitation. One thing, however, may safely be said, namely, that it owes a good deal to the character of the feminine leaders. Two of the most conspicuous agitators are the sisters, Mrs. Anderson and Mrs. Fawcett, the last the wife of the member for Brighton. Mrs. Ander-

son has a high reputation as a physician, and Mrs. Fawcett has assisted her husband in setting forth the principles of political economy. Both of them, if I may be permitted to venture so far towards personality, are of thoroughly ladylike appearance and manners, and they have considerable talents as public speakers. They owe a great deal of their success to avoiding the danger into which feminine advocates of Radicalism are too apt to fall, of adopting extreme and, if one may now be permitted to use the word in any but a complimentary sense, womanish views of political questions. Indeed, if one were inclined to find fault with them, perhaps one would be disposed to say that they were rather too obtrusively masculine and unsentimental. Mrs. Fawcett, for example, is an ardent advocate of the Malthusian doctrines. She has lately published a volume of essays in conjunction with her husband, of which it appears to be one main object to attack what used in old-fashioned phraseology to be called the divine law about increasing and multiplying. She vigorously attacks the movement for gratuitous education, because she thinks that if children could get their schooling for nothing there would soon be more children than we could feed. In all this there is a good deal of sense, which is put forward in a rather hard and uncompromising manner. If we might judge from such specimens, we might be disposed to think that the most conspicuous result of admitting women to the franchise would be to give new currency to the driest and severest rules of political economists. However, as we ought to be all aware, though I cannot say that reformers generally seem to have laid the lesson to heart, the motives which dictate the choice of a particular bit of political machinery are generally quite different from the purposes to which it is directed in practice. The emancipated part of the sex is of course that which clamors most loudly for the removal of the present restrictions: but it is quite another and a very difficult question whether they would be allowed to guide the force which they seek to put in action. However that may be, the meetings of which I have spoken were roused to a high pitch of enthusiasm, and went far to justify the opinion of those who took part in them that the agitation now fairly launched is one of those which may be expected to gather strength as time goes on.

A certain chill was cast over the enthusiasm when the House of Commons was invited on Wednesday to pronounce its verdict on the proposal. The debate was a dreary one on both sides; but two or three members have been converted backwards since last year, and the proposal was cast out by a larger majority than before. The numbers were 222 to 143. The more prominent leaders, as, for example, Mr. Gladstone and Mr. Disraeli, abstained from recording their votes, and the composition both of the majority and minority was rather curious. Thirty-five Conservatives voted for the bill, whilst it was opposed by a considerable number of Liberals. The present Attorney-General, Sir J. Coleridge, and Mr. Disraeli's Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. Ward Hunt, voted for the women, whilst several Ministers voted against them. Probably a good many members were determined by a consideration the relevancy of which is energetically disputed by the agitators. It can hardly be doubted that the first effect of the measure would be to increase the power of the clerical and Conservative party, whatever might be its consequences in the long run. We are of course informed that it is opposed to all principles of justice to consider which way people are likely to vote before entrusting them with the franchise; but practical men will insist upon taking that consideration into account; and it is not unreasonable to suspect that Mr. Disraeli, who almost avowedly admitted the lowest classes to the franchise because he thought that they would be more accessible to the influences of rank and property than those immediately above them, may have a similar project in his mind when he abstains from opposing this concession to women. However that may be, the arguments on both sides avoided this delicate topic, and ran through the ordinary platitudes about human rights on one side and about the sphere of woman on the other.

Meanwhile, a good deal is being made by the ladies of a couple of practical arguments. One is that several women were elected upon schoolboards, and, though I fear it can hardly be said that the school-boards have discharged their duties in a manner calculated to awaken the admiration of the universe, the female members are supposed to have shown as much capacity as their male rivals. The other argument which has lately received some practical illustration is derived from the manners and customs of our laboring classes. The husbands have a decided mode of expressing their views of masculine government which is not exactly creditable. Lately, for example, a miner knocked down his wife for no particular reason, and proceeded to kick her to death in the presence of her children and of several neighbors who had not the courage to interfere. These brutalities, it is assumed, would disappear, or would at any rate be more severely repressed as soon as women received votes. A gentleman who had knocked out the eye of his wife or mistress (I forgot which) was punished by three months'

imprisonment, whilst seven years' penal servitude were not thought too much for a less aggravated assault upon a man. Probably the judge might have some justification for an apparently preposterous decision; but several such events which have occurred lately have been turned to great account by the advocates of women's rights. On the other hand, there is apparently a slight reaction in a conservative direction. Concession to any popular cry has become so much the rule lately that there is a strong *prima-facie* presumption that any proposal to abolish anything will sooner or later meet with success, and a temporary defeat will by no means damp the spirit of the assailants of any privilege. Just for the time, however, it seems to have occurred to a few people that we are asked to take rather a leap in the dark, and that a little hesitation is permissible before admitting a principle which might not only upset the existing balance of political power, but lead to an indefinite series of important social changes.

With the exception of this little episode, Parliament has been staggering on pretty much in its old ruts. Three severe defeats in one week lately showed how much the influence of Mr. Gladstone's Government has declined; and yet it is also incidentally clear that nobody wishes to get rid of them at the present moment. The most significant passage of arms was that which took place between Mr. Gladstone and Mr. Fawcett. Mr. Fawcett had succeeded, contrary to the general expectation, in securing another hearing for his bill upon Dublin University. It leaked out through the *Daily News* that Mr. Gladstone was prepared to treat a vote in favor of Mr. Fawcett's bill as a vote of want of confidence. According to the usual parliamentary etiquette, precedence should have been given over all other measures to Mr. Fawcett's motion. When, however, the critical evening arrived, Mr. Gladstone explained at his usual length that, although the Government would certainly not continue in office should such a measure be passed, he did not consider its proposal as amounting to a direct vote of want of confidence, and accordingly that he did not feel bound to provide a day for its discussion. Translated out of parliamentary language, this simply means to say that Government is determined to shelve the question for the present session. They are determined not to show their hands or to announce any definite line of policy. They will not say whether they are carrying on a flirtation with the priests, and ready in one form or other to give in to the demands of the Roman Catholic hierarchy; though of course they assert in general terms that the course which they intend to adopt will be thoroughly satisfactory to everybody, and especially to their own party. And on the other hand, Parliament is not disposed to press them. So soon as it was known that Mr. Gladstone was ready to stake the existence of the Government on the fate of Mr. Fawcett's motion, everybody, with the exception of one or two ardent radicals, was only too glad to smother up the question for the present. The secret is a very open one. A great many Liberal members have no desire to encounter the risks and expenses of another dissolution, which must follow the unseating of ministers. On the other hand, the Conservatives are by no means anxious to press for a speedy decision. They have a confident expectation that if Mr. Gladstone has rope enough he will succeed in hanging himself. The tide of discontent has been gradually rising, and they do not wish to spoil their game by snatching prematurely at the fruits of victory. On the two last occasions of their coming into office they were merely on sufferance, and they would prefer waiting until their opponents have accumulated a sufficient load of odium to give a decided Conservative majority, and to promise them a more or less durable tenure of office. They have, moreover, been expecting to find a more favorable battle-ground in the American negotiations. We now, I am thankful to say, have hopes of a satisfactory solution of the difficulty, and if the United States withdraw the indirect claims, the result of minor importance will be that Mr. Gladstone will have extricated himself from a very ugly scrape. I am afraid, indeed, that under any circumstances there is not much cause for boasting as to our mode of carrying on negotiations; but one may say with some truth that in such matters all is well that ends well. If, after all, the Treaty should break down, Government will be exposed to a very serious attack, and there will be no longer the motive for keeping them in office derived from the necessity of allowing them to conclude the transaction.

And meanwhile there is something not very pleasing of contemplation about the general aspect of our politics. The Ballot Bill has at last been got through committee, though, as some people maintain, with very serious mutilations. Whether mutilated or not, I do not suppose that any reasonable person who has not been getting up the subject for hustings speeches cares one farthing about it, or believes that it will make the very smallest difference one way or the other, or, in short, considers it from any other point of view than that of a crotchet which has somehow got embodied in the recognized list of orthodox liberal measures. Government finds it a cheap and easy mode of advertising its own heartiness in the cause; but one is inclined to wonder, after the old-established precedent, how any two of its energetic

advocates can look each other in the face without laughing. Indeed, I suspect they sometimes cannot. Yet the whole session has been devoted to endless twaddle about this sham bit of liberalism, and will probably be fruitless of all other results. We are going through a period evidently like that which succeeded the Reform Bill of 1832. The first impulse produced by the extension of the franchise has been pretty well exhausted by the Irish Church and Land Bills, and it is being succeeded by a general indifference, due to the discovery that we have not yet entered the millennium. At any rate, one result is that we are just now uncommonly dull.

ARMY REORGANIZATION IN GERMANY.

BERLIN, April 30, 1872.

"**T**HERE is no Germany but Prussia," said a proud official the other day, "all else is *Schwindel*," which, being interpreted, signifies "humbug." Such, however, is not the tone of the Prussian Government, whether of the king or of the Ministry. It is now generally believed that the Emperor refrained from opening the Reichstag in person through a delicate regard for the standing of the sovereigns of the smaller states, whose choice had designated him to the headship of Germany; he would not impart a personal character to an occasion the dignity and interest of which should centre in the affairs of the nation. He would not monopolize for Prussia the honors of the Empire. In the same spirit the Chancellor of the Empire, Prince Bismarck, in a speech before the Reichstag, advocated an adjustment of times and topics between the national and the local parliaments, which should ensure as far as possible their working together toward a common end. As it now is, the session of the Reichstag in Berlin comes in conflict with the protracted sessions of the Landtag in Würtemberg and in Bavaria, so that many members of those local parliaments, who are also members of the national parliament, are not in their places here. The Prussian Government is careful to magnify the national parliament, so far as this can be done without prejudice to the internal economy of Prussia herself. For though Prussia has been the making of Germany, and is and must continue to be the leader of the Empire as now constituted, he would not use the Empire as a tail by which to fly her kite, but would feel the Empire behind her as a well-articulated and firmly-compacted body, of which she is the proper and the guiding head. For, if this now incorporated unity of Germany shall endure, the whole body must be fashioned substantially after the model of Prussia; and that is the question which just now absorbs the attention of Parliament and of the press through the discussion of the code of military uniformity. If Prussia has made Germany, the army has made Prussia. That army is the product of long and careful study in the science of organization, and especially of the combination of intelligence and discipline. Bull Run taught the North how little intelligence, patriotism, and enthusiasm could avail in battle without military discipline; Sadowa taught Austria that a merely tactical discipline must yield to a discipline guided by intelligence; and Sedan taught France and the world that *prestige, gloire, élán*, were nothing when both intelligence and discipline were wanting.

Now, if Germany would hold the position she has gained in Europe, she must for many years keep her army up to the Prussian standard of numbers, intelligence, and discipline. This I say with all deference to the Peace Society, and in the interest of the peace of Europe. A proposal from Germany for the joint reduction of the military force would be met by France with scorn or with treachery. For a whole generation the motto of every political party in France will be "Revenge upon Germany"; Austria may not long submit to be overawed by Prussia, nor Russia admit that she is overmatched by her Teutonic neighbor, without a trial of strength; and the Pope would not scruple to stir up a war in any quarter which might promise him a restoration of the tiara. For her own existence, therefore, as well as for the stability of peace in Europe, in our day at least, Germany must be a military nation. But for her efficiency as a military power, uniformity of organization and of discipline must be secured throughout the Empire. The Prussian type of organization and drill is now provided for through the training-schools for officers, of which that at Potsdam is a model. To these schools under-officers are sent from all parts of the Empire, in a certain ratio for every regiment; and these students become allied to one another as comrades, and carry back the same regimen to their several barracks. It remains, however, to bring the whole army under a common discipline, and for this the Government has introduced a military code which now agitates Parliament. The army of the Empire on a peace footing consists of infantry 259,216 (of which Prussia furnishes about 180,000), cavalry 65,236 (Prussian, 46,000), artillery 41,759 (Prussian, about 29,000). Add to these some 15,000 pioneers, etc., and in the total peace army 383,899, Prussia is represented by about 260,000; and in the war-footing of 1,117,000 combatants she furnishes even a larger ratio. Prussia, long ago (at the instance of Stein), abolished

from her army corporal punishment, running the gauntlet, and other cruel and degrading penalties; but her military code still retains severe punishments, such as imprisonment in a dark cell, without fire or bed, and with only bread and water. Deputy Lasker made a long and eloquent speech against such punishments as degrading to the person of the citizen, and inhuman upon physiological grounds. He would have the army governed by intelligence and by moral motives, and would reform it into an institution of philanthropy. The conservatives are aghast at this as foretelling the breaking down of all order in the state, and introducing an era of social democracy; and many liberals feel that their champion is going too fast and too far. The comic papers picture jolly soldiers petting the little figure of Lasker, and calling him a nice boy. When we consider that compulsory military service brings together all grades of intelligence and all sorts of character, it can hardly seem safe to dispense with all physical rigor in the discipline of so vast an army. Just now the bill is so encumbered with amendments that it is difficult to foresee its fate; but the prevailing feeling is that there must be but one army, in training, in spirit, and in discipline, throughout the Empire, and that the Prussian system has proved itself the best. The philanthropy of peace must wait a little longer upon the discipline of danger.

AUSWANDERER.

Correspondence.

IS THERE NO REMEDY FOR THE CINCINNATI NOMINATIONS?
TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: It is to be hoped that you will ere long consider in your paper the question which is just now perplexing many minds—whether it is better, as matters now stand, to support Grant or Greeley.

At least a portion of those who went to Cincinnati and those who at home were in favor of the movement desired to wage war, not upon a man, but upon a system. As Mr. Schurz said, "anybody to beat Grant" was not the prime idea of the Liberal movement. Horace Greeley was beyond question one of the last men whom a person not "inside politics" would have considered the best exponent of the reform idea, and it is also beyond question that he owes his nomination, at least in part, to the efforts of shrewd politicians who did believe in the "anybody to beat Grant" doctrine.

Will it not be really more dangerous to the true cause of reform that Greeley should be elected rather than Grant? It seems to be generally admitted that Greeley is a man who, though honest in purpose, is easily "fooled" and misled by those in whom he places confidence, and that he does place confidence in some of the worst of the tribe of "Toms" and "managers" to be found in the country—men who have no more real sympathy with any reform that would deprive them of place and patronage than have Carpenter, Butler, and their like.

But in the one case there is no pretence that the candidate represents reform. He asks to be re-elected because things as they now are are on the whole satisfactory. Should he be re-elected, and should many things which we consider abuses be continued, at all events we should not be responsible.

If the next four years are to be like the last two, they will not bring discredit upon those who have dared to demand a change, but will so teach the people the need of a new order of things, that in 1876 there may be an uprising such as took place in New York last November. But can we have confidence or hope that Greeley and his advisers will heal the foul sore in the body politic from whence these abuses come; and, if not, if these things continue under a nominally "reform Administration," will it not have a tendency to disgust and dishearten the honest supporters of the movement, and afford such opportunities for animadversion on the part of its enemies, that real reform will be postponed for years?

P.

NEW YORK, May 14, 1872.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: There were many who, thinking the Cincinnati movement merely a disaffection among the Republican politicians, and expecting little from that class, took no interest in it until the name of Charles Francis Adams was broached for the nomination, when it became a thing of life. My own interest thus awakened, I made it a point during the month of April—spent in travelling through several States, North and South—to discuss the prospect freely; and the satisfaction with which his nomination was expected of the Cincinnati Convention was so widespread that it astonished as much as it gratified me. It is no idle assertion to say that three-fourths of all with whom I came in contact accepted his probable nomination as the harbinger of better things in our political life; and these expressions were not passively given, but earnestly and with evident conviction. Nor were these

sentiments confined to members of any one party; they were common alike to Democrats and Republicans—accustomed, heretofore, to work in the party traces, and accept the dictum of their party leaders. There were Republicans who had striven for, because they believed in, the doctrines which their party advocated, but who now feel that if it has not “achieved its mission,” it has at least outlived its usefulness; that while it has wrought much good in the past, it falls short of the demands of the future; that it seeks to rest from its labors, and trade on the glory of its traditions. This will not do. In our country, we cannot sit down and content ourselves with what has been done. When any party shows that disposition, its vitality is on the wane. The motto of the Republic is ever “Excelsior.” We must go on; and those who cannot lead must stand aside. There were Democrats, too, anxious for the opportunity that Adams’s nomination would afford, to bring about a better order of things—men strong in their party discipline, but satisfied by successive defeats that their party has lost its hold on the people’s confidence.

To learn that this is the actual condition of things, it is not necessary to go far from home. Within the circle of one’s own friends and acquaintances they exist. Men who have been associated together, as well as those who have been separated by party lines, find a singular harmony of views as to the ends which need our best efforts in the coming years. There is no real difference between us as to the vital matters to be secured, and we are only kept apart and working at cross purposes by the politicians. We are under the whip of the “ring-masters”—men who consider many things besides the wants of the national life; men with whom the paramount consideration is what will catch the popular fancy, and best secure their own control of the vast patronage which our unfortunate system renders possible; men who look to “availability,” and are too short-sighted or too wilfully blind to know that the most *fit* is the most available. It was these men who crowded and choked the Cincinnati Convention to such inadequate expression. The Liberal Republican movement, which promised so well, is only a partial movement, a half-way step; and, as organized, gives no assurance of anything new save in the way of party leaders, trained in the same school with those who now rule the nation for their selfish ends. Are we, who wanted not only a change of men but a change of means far more, and who looked to Charles Francis Adams’s character and record as the realization and embodiment of our best aspirations—are we to be thwarted thus? Must we accept the “lame and impotent conclusions” of the Cincinnati Convention? Is there no remedy? Shall we quietly fold our hands and see the politicians twist us to their own uses?

There were enough good men at Cincinnati, there are enough to-day in the Democratic and Republican ranks who seek something higher, to form the nucleus of a national party that shall send the nation forward with new impetus along the ever ascending plane of civilization. Why cannot such a party be organized—free from the shackles of old party traditions, and seeking only the welfare of the Republic? Good men and true from all sections and from all parties are eager to lend themselves to the good work if it be once fairly started. Can there be a time more propitious than this, when there are so many who realize and regret the failure of the political conventions to respond to the spirit of the people?

Very respectfully, etc.,

S. W. EDGAR.

WILMINGTON, DEL., May 14, 1872.

DEAR—: I suppose we agree in the opinion that the Cincinnati Convention is a failure. The question is, What next? I do not pretend to be a politician, but I think it was a mistake to call a convention. Some wise man—I forget who—said he never asked advice unless he was prepared to follow it when given, and I do not think that Wells, Trumbull, and Schurz should have run the risk of consulting with such men as McClure and Scovell. The convention necessarily was, to a great extent, a self-appointed body, and nobody would pretend that some of the delegates—those from Pennsylvania for instance—at all represented the body of respectable citizens who are disappointed with Grant’s administration. I know that a political party cannot be altogether composed of wise and pure men, and the case of Adullam is often cited as an instance in point; but there David was on the ground first and master of the situation, and whatever the rest were, he was wise and good, and had control of the others.

Now, if I am right so far, what is the remedy? I think I will offer a suggestion, though it may be too late now, and might not have been practicable at any time.

In a Democratic country, it is of no use to try to force any measures, however good, upon the people before they are prepared for them. But they are the wise leaders of the people who are able to give shape to a growing sentiment, and to present it to the people in such a form that they recog-

nize it as their own. I think Wells, Trumbull, and Schurz might interpret the feelings of a large part of the people. Now let them, with such others as they may choose to consult with, frame a platform—a platform broad enough for a number to stand on, but distinctive enough to make it worth while to get up a party to maintain, giving no uncertain sound about free trade and reform, asking for amnesty for the South for the same reason that Lincoln would have given—“Charity for all, malice towards none,” and for the same reason avoiding anything like unkind personalities towards other men and parties. It is hardly likely that after the failure at Cincinnati a nomination on such a platform could be now made, even if it was desirable. But let the men who start the movement, keeping the reins in their own hands, see whether good men cannot be found in each State—men of standing, whose wisdom and disinterestedness were generally acknowledged, who would be willing to run as electors for such a party. It might be that some States could be carried for the principles—not men—of the party, and that when the electoral college met there would be in it some men, unpledged to any candidate, who could influence, if not control, the election. I think it would be a move in the right direction to try to return to the original idea of electoral colleges, composed of the best men of the country, to whom the selection of President and Vice-President was entrusted. It would at all events be a “new departure,” and that in the present state of the Reform party would be something.

All this may seem very visionary, but I dare say the *Nation* will have divers suggestions equally crude made to it, and while I do not wish to address any “communication” to that paper, I thought I would take an indirect way of letting the editors have my thoughts. If it shows nothing else, it does this: that there are some men who had hoped something from the Reform movement, who would still like to see some other course open to them than to support Cameron and Forney.

Very truly thy friend,

PHILADELPHIA, 5th month, 6, 1872.

[The above was not written for publication, but it is too suggestive to be withheld from the public.—ED. NATION.]

MR. DANA, AND THE AMERICAN CASE.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: In your paper of the 16th I see the following statement:

“We know that he [Mr. Bancroft Davis] did submit the proofs [of the American Case] to such men as Judge Hoar, Mr. R. H. Dana, Jr., and President Woolsey; but we know, too, that none of those gentlemen saw, or at least have any recollection of seeing, the claim for the expenses of the war after Gettysburg.”

While it is true that Mr. Bancroft Davis did pay me the compliment to send me the printed Case for criticism, I wish to add that I did not examine it. I returned it to him with the seals unbroken, for reasons conclusive to my own mind, and to which Mr. Davis took no exception, although he politely expressed his regret at my determination. I ought to add that the request to examine the argument was not made to me by the Government or by the Department of State, but by Mr. Davis, as a personal and private matter.

Yours very truly,

R. H. DANA, JR.

BOSTON, May 20, 1872.

Notes.

THE Palestine Exploration Society, recently organized here with a view to maintaining the high reputation of American scholarship in that Oriental field, has selected for special investigation the country beyond the Jordan—the Moab, Ammon, Gilead, and Bashan of old—and purposes a complete examination of the meteorology, topography, archaeology, geology, zoölogy, and botany of the region in question. As an historical scientific undertaking, it may properly enlist the support of Jews, Christians, and Gentiles generally, and contributions from any source will be welcome. Rev. James H. Dwight, 26 Exchange Place, is the General Agent; Mr. James Stokes, Jr., 104 John Street, the Treasurer.—Lee & Shepard republish Tylor’s “Researches into the Early History of Mankind” and “Primitive Culture,” and announce also the following American works: “Autobiography of Amos Kendall”—Jackson’s Postmaster-General, and the man who permitted the grossest violation of the mails ever tolerated in a civilized country—edited by Wm. Stickney; a “Handbook of English Literature” (American authors), by F. H. Underwood; Vose’s “Handbook of Railroad Construction,” together, says the publishers’ advertisement, with railroad maps and

plans never before published, "and which eminent engineers have, for the purpose of examining, crossed seas and continents"; and "Stories and Poems by Mother and Daughter," who are Mrs. Caroline Gilman and Mrs. Lewis H. Jersey, respectively.—A good many interested readers should be found for "Autumnal Cataract, commonly called 'Hay Fever,'" by Dr. Morris Wyman, of Cambridge, announced by Hurd & Houghton.—Turnbull Bros., Baltimore, will publish a "History of Annapolis and the U. S. Naval Academy," by Owen M. Taylor.—"Monarchy in America under Louis XIV," by Francis Parkman, is to be the fourth volume of this author's invaluable series called "France and England in North America," and bears, like the preceding, the imprint of Little, Brown & Co., who also publish a new edition of Richard Frothingham's "Siege of Boston"—an exhaustive monograph—and "The Rise of the Republic of the United States," by the same writer.—Dodd & Mead, 762 Broadway, have become agents for the sale of the publications of the American Naturalist's Agency and Peabody Academy of Science, at Salem, Mass.—The second annual meeting of that prosperous organization, the American Institute of Mining Engineers, is now in progress in this city, the proceedings being held in the rooms of the Geographical Society at the Cooper Union. To-night and to-morrow night will be the last opportunity of listening to the papers, discussions, etc., the daytime being given up to excursions to various points of professional and scientific interest in this vicinity. The rapid growth of this society is as remarkable as it is encouraging, and at Wilkesbarre, Bethlehem, Troy, and Philadelphia it has met with decided social successes.

—Mr. Robert Morris Copeland, a landscape gardener of large experience, has been making a contribution to the great-city problem in an "Essay and Plan for the Improvement of the City of Boston" (Boston: Lee & Shepard), which will be found worth reading even by those who fancy that they have no interest in this particular application of a general principle. That such a notion is a mistaken one we need not labor to prove. It would be none the less mistaken if Boston were not "the most beautiful city in America," and capable of being made still more so. Mr. Copeland approaches the subject, in the first place, from the side of sanitary, commercial, and other economical considerations, but is most at home when urging his strictly professional view, with a sort of fervor which only a Bostonian could feel, and with an intimate knowledge of those delightful suburbs which, sooner or later, are destined to be wholly absorbed by the city. We regard his main proposition as entirely correct, and almost self-evident: that the nature of the ground indicates a series of verdant preserves, embracing the numerous heights which encircle the city, and knit together by a system of highways of a more or less sylvan character. One great merit of this design is that each quarter of the future city would have a breathing-place of its own, distinctive in its special attractions, accessible without long journeying, and still forming part of the net-work of drives and walks. Another is that the public would retain its rightful hold on eminences affording such a diversity of prospect as is seldom witnessed, and which are already in danger of being lowered into the plain by the remorseless steam-shovel. Whether the public has not as good a right to the Charles River front and sunset, is a question on which we should think there would be a difference of opinion between Mr. Copeland and his fellow-citizens. They will probably accept, too, with difficulty his ingenious proposal to run a freight railway between the Common and the Public Garden, as part of a system of railroad communication between all the depots. Perhaps he is too confident in anticipating, as one of the consequences of that system, the withdrawal of all wholesale business "from the narrow and crooked streets of old Boston." In New York our experience is, that this business prefers the narrow streets, even with horse-cars running through them, to the broad ones; and we believe that no one expects that the next removal up-town will make Canal Street the centre of the wholesale trade, but rather Grand or Broome Street. To catch a customer, or to visit a great number of dealers before purchasing, is much easier in an alley than on an avenue; and Mr. Copeland would, we apprehend, find a similar contentment with their crowded locality on the part of the wool-dealers on Federal, Channing, and Congress Streets, in Boston.

—Mr. Thomas Buchanan Read, who died in this city last week, was one of the better representatives of a class of American literary men whose day is now pretty much over. He flourished as poet in a time when to have written smooth verses, to have had them praised in an English review as very good for United States verses, and to have had them judicially considered in the *North American Review*, was to have secured a title to be called a poet of distinction. As we have said, Mr. Read was better than many of the men who thus had fame thrust upon them, and he cannot, as some of his contemporaries can, be made to look ridiculous by simply collating their works and the praises which were heaped upon them by a generous public.

Nothing that he has written will live, but he had true poetic feeling, he worked conscientiously, and his poetry is better than most of what is produced for the magazines. We do not think it is much better. Besides being a poet, Mr. Read, who began life as a sculptor, was a painter in fair repute, though about his painting, as about his poetry, there was something very amateur-like. As in the case of Mr. Story, another American genius of all trades, his work better expressed a general aesthetic turn than any marked bent in a particular direction, and he had still less than Mr. Story's intellectual power. Mr. Read was born in Chester, Pennsylvania, in 1822. His best known productions are a picture and a poem both of which have for their subject General Sheridan's action at the battle of Fisher's Hill. Neither the picture nor the poem has other than extremely popular merit, and neither can be taken as of historical fidelity.

—The treeless plains of the West are about the only portions of our country where the cultivation of timber is pursued, and there the sole aim seems to be to procure material for fencing the land. In our wooded districts, the timber is either entirely removed, or else only the worthless trees are left standing, and nothing is done to prevent the supply of useful wood from becoming exhausted. A very good opportunity is now offered to show to the community the value of care in this important matter. Some large corporations in the Eastern States have lately acquired large tracts of mining land, much of which is fit only for the growth of timber. The forests that once covered the land are gone, and the soil is either barren or is producing stunted trees and useless shrubs. By planting such trees as are best suited to the soil and climate, these corporations would, in a short time, be able to supply themselves with much of the timber which they are now compelled to bring from a distance, and the rapid growth of the cultivated trees would soon convince the landholder of the advantage of a little care and intelligence in dealing with our forests. Meantime, our agricultural colleges and our Agricultural Bureau (if the right sort of man were at the head of it) might give to arboriculture something of the attention which it merits, and which it has obtained in other countries, as, for instance, in Germany, whose schools are visited by students from all countries. According to a Blue Book on forest conservancy in India, only ten years ago railway sleepers had to be imported from Norway, for though the forests renewed themselves by seeding, the jungle choked the new growth wherever the good timber had been entirely cut away. A German arboriculturist, Dr. Brandis, was appointed to organize a forest department in British Burmah (that province furnishing the chief supply of teak), and in 1864 there were fifty conservators in the one province in Bengal, all Government officials, chosen by competitive examination, after having received a training in the forest schools of France and Germany. Norway and Sweden also have profited by these institutions, saving many a copper and iron mine from enforced idleness; and even Spain is resorting to them, in spite of the proverbial hatred of a Spaniard for a tree. The good results produced in France, in preventing floods and devastating torrents, by scientific forest culture, are notorious. To awaken an interest in this subject in the United States, we have only to spread the necessary information; and happily we have for this purpose one of the best works in any language. Mr. Geo. P. Marsh's "Man and Nature," circulated as a whole or separately in tracts, would both interest and enlighten our farming population. Cannot Messrs. Scribner, Armstrong & Co. give them a cheap edition, of the handy size of the Italian version published in Florence? and could the *Tribune* render a greater service to its country readers than by making some arrangement for the sale of this admirable work?

—A new edition of his "Rob Roy on the Baltic" gives Mr. Macgregor an opportunity of stating that the lectures he has delivered regarding his several cruises have produced nearly \$33,000, which has been paid over in full to churches, schools, hospitals, and societies; and further that all the expenses of these cruises were amply covered by the sale of their "logs." Other books of travel that have recently appeared or will shortly appear in England, embrace Payton's "Diamond Diggings of South Africa"; "Modern Turkey," by J. Lewis Farley, Consul of the Sublime Porte at Bristol; "Thirty Years in the Harem," by Madam Kibrizli Mehemet Pasha; Captain Burton and Mr. Tyrwhitt Drake's "Moabite Cities"; "In the Morningland: Travel and Discussion with the late H. T. Buckle," by J. S. Stuart Glennie; the late Captain John Wood's "Journey to the Source of the River Oxus"; "Life in India," by E. N. C. Braddon, of Lucknow; the third volume of the Marquis de Beauvoir's "Voyage round the World," treating of Pekin, Jeddo, and San Francisco; "Very Far West Indeed," telling of rough experiences on the N. W. Pacific Coast, by R. Byron Johnson; and "The Great Lone Land," by Captain Butler, of the Red River Expedition of 1869-70. In biography we have the peculiarly English "Life of Thomas Cooper, the Chartist Poet," by himself;

a "Life of Captain Marryat," by his daughter, Mrs. Ross Church; more "Letters of Lord Byron," leaving none to come after that have not been already in print, and "entirely free from scandalous matter"; the "Letters and Journals of James, Eighth Earl of Elgin," Viceroy of India, Governor of Jamaica, and Governor-General of Canada, and one of the very best characters among modern English administrators; the "Diaries and Letters of Sir George Jackson, from the Peace of Amiens to the Battle of Talavera"—another capable though less famous official; and Mrs. Oliphant's "Memoirs of Count Montalembert." With these may be mentioned "Alexis de Tocqueville—Correspondence and Conversation with Nassau W. Senior," edited by Mrs. M. E. Simpson; and another posthumous work, "Notes of Thought and Conversation," by the late Charles Buxton, M.P.

—"A History of the Church of France," by W. Hentley Jervis; "A Catechism of English History," edited by Miss E. M. Sewell; and "The History of Modern Serbia," by Elodie Lawton Miyatovics, are the only historical works that need mention. The following titles we give without formal classification: "A Dictionary of Christian Antiquities and Biography," edited of course by Dr. William Smith; the "History of Creation," by Prof. Ernst Haeckel, which we can hardly follow the *Bookseller* in putting under the head of "religious" announcements; "A Manual of Palaeontology," by Prof. H. Alleyne Nicholson; "Elementary Lessons in Anatomy," by St. George Mivart; "The Forms of Water in Clouds, Rain, Rivers, Ice, and Glaciers," by Prof. Tyndall; "Contemporary English Psychology," from the French of Prof. Ribot; "An Essay on the Culture of the Observing Powers of Children"—a promising title, surely—by Joseph Payne; "The Rise and Development of Mediaeval Architecture," lectures by G. G. Scott; "Prospective," by Lieut. W. H. Collins, R.E.; "A Volume of Emblems," illustrated, by Mrs. Alfred Gatty; "Memorials of the Dead," by F. and M. A. Palliser, a selection of epitaphs "for general use and study."

—The physical explanation offered by Mr. Stillman in our last issue, of Turner's so-called astigmatic representations of nature, is corroborated by Mr. W. Mattieu Williams in a communication to *Nature* of April 25. This writer is the author of a work called "Through Norway with a Knapsack," published in 1859, on page 67 of which he said, speaking of the peculiar midnight sunset effects of the North:

"Turner, like an eagle, has dared to face the sun in his full glare, and to place him in the middle of his pictures, showing us how we see a landscape with sun-dazzled eyes, when everything is melted into a luminous chaos, and all the details blotted out with misty brightness."

And he now adds:

"In all these peculiar pictures that I have seen the sun is thus placed in the middle of the picture, and just sufficiently above the horizon (from about 10° to 20°, or at most 25°) to pour his rays about perpendicularly to the curvature of the eye-ball, when the face is in position to contemplate a landscape. I have frequently repeated the experiment of contemplating a landscape under such circumstances, and on every occasion of submitting to such torture have seen all the effects of even the most extravagant of Turner's later pictures, which are so well described by Dr. Liebreich. I have seen the 'vertical streakiness, which is caused by every illuminated point having been changed into a vertical line,' with an 'elongation, generally speaking, in exact proportion to the brightness of the light,' and that 'there proceeds from the sun, in the centre of the picture, a vertical yellow streak.'

He explains the vertical streaks by reference to the flow of tears caused by the dazzle, producing on the lower eyelid a little pool "the surface of which has a considerable vertical curvature," and in that direction "must act as a lens of very short focus," and "produce a vertical magnifying effect, the definition of which will of course be very confused and obscure on account of the irregular curvature, and the fact that the eye is focussed to the distant objects." As for the other phenomena represented by Turner, they are, in Mr. Williams's opinion, "simply a faithful copying of the effects of glare and suffusion produced by painful sun-gazing, and the looking at a landscape where the shadows are, so to speak, nowhere, or all behind one's back." So it would seem as if the Turnerites might breathe again, for whether or not an artist had best look at landscapes with tears in his eyes, it seems to be a fact that so looking he may see what Turner's pictures record.

—Particular accounts of the recent fire at Düsseldorf show that it broke out on the morning of the 20th of March, at three o'clock, in the Academy, and a great portion of the old building was destroyed. Fortunately the valuable collection of drawings, etchings, and engravings by the old masters were saved, also the wing of the Academy containing the old picture-gallery, and in which was Rubens's "Ascension of the Virgin." The collection of pictures by the modern Düsseldorf school is safe, having been removed from the academy building some four years ago to a suitable gallery built expressly for it. The remnant of the once celebrated Düsseldorf gallery was also saved, although there are but few pictures among them of any great merit. The

good ones were all removed some years ago to Munich. These, with the elementary and antique class-rooms, together with the library, are all that was saved: the rest, which was nearly two-thirds of the whole building, was entirely destroyed. Certain artists who had their studios in the part of the building that was burnt suffered losses of considerable importance. Professor F. Müller lost an altar-piece on which he had been working for four years. It was a commission from an American, and was valued at 10,000 thalers. Müller's pictures are very much admired by the lovers of high finish, and of motives imitated from the early pictures of Raphael, Perugino, Gentile da Fabbriano, and others of the mystic Umbrian school. But few of them have been brought to this country. In part of the building the Rhenish and Westphalian Kunstverein had its offices, and all the books, records, plates, and engravings belonging to the association were totally destroyed, including among the plates Professor Keller's engraving of the "Disputa," on which he had been at work more than ten years, and from which but few impressions had been taken.

—The sale of the pictures, water-colors, studies, and sketches left behind him by the late Henri Regnault, the young artist—one of the directors of the porcelain manufactory at Sèvres—whose name was suddenly made famous by his "Salomé," exhibited in the Salon of '70, and who was killed in the last sortie from Paris in the opening of the next year (19th January, 1871), proved extremely successful. There were nineteen pieces in oil, for which 75,460 francs were obtained; twenty water-color drawings, which fetched 44,260 francs; one hundred and twenty-five studies, sketches, pencil-drawings, pen-drawings, and other slight matters, which brought 20,911 francs, making a total of 141,031 francs. Something of this result must be attributed to the enthusiasm for Regnault's memory, but by no means all. He was a painter of no ordinary power, and if he had lived would have made a great impression upon French art. The sale took place on the 5th and 6th of April. On the 4th was the sale of the pictures belonging to the late Duke de Persigny, when was seen the fate that waits on an amateur with slim knowledge and a well-filled purse. The pictures went a-begging, although the late duke's galleries were believed by himself and his set to be rich in "Rafaelles, Correggios, and stuff." Among a crowd of copies, and pictures wrongly ascribed, were a few genuine and valuable works which went for far less than their real value, owing to the general belief that had got abroad that the collection was wholly worthless. Among others, says the *Chronique des Arts*, was a picture attributed to Velasquez, and which was probably painted by one of his scholars or followers, Mago, Pareja, or perhaps Carreño de Miranda. This picture, remarkable in itself, was sold for 750 francs—a price far below its value. It is on such occasions—and they occur more often than might be supposed—that the real connoisseur comes sailing in triumphantly and bears off his prize; the amateurs, and make-believe knowing ones, discovering too late that a thinker has been let loose among them.

DEAN STANLEY.*

I.

DEAN STANLEY is the most popular English writer on ecclesiastical history. He has engaged in all the theological controversies of the day, and is the leader of the "Broad Church." Yet he can hardly be called an historian, and is certainly not a dialectician. His influence as a writer, a preacher, and a party leader is due in part, no doubt, to his high personal character, but mainly to the fact that he is, though an inaccurate historian and a loose thinker, an almost unrivalled rhetorician. His rhetoric, which owes a good deal of its power to being probably unconscious, can be traced in every page he has written, for in every line you will see the true rhetorical power of presenting facts so as to strike the imagination and to suggest conclusions which are hardly stated, combined, it must be added, in many cases with a rhetorician's weakness for warping facts which do not bear out his views. In no book which the Dean of Westminster has written is the rhetorical character of his mind and of his works more manifest than in his recent lectures. Readers who look at the book as an historical sketch will feel equal amazement and disappointment. As a history it is absolutely worthless, and this not because of the small size of the work, for a writer of much less than Dean Stanley's skill might easily within the space at his command have given a clear outline either of the external or of the dogmatic history of Scotch ecclesiastical institutions. Dean Stanley presents us no history either of the church or of its dogmas. He commences with a sermon about the new commandment; he then gives a sketch of the church before the Reformation, which seems to have very little bearing on the development of the modern kirk; and then, when, after apparently wasting the limit

* "Lectures on the History of the Church of Scotland, delivered in Edinburgh, in 1872, by Arthur Penrhyn Stanley, D.D., Dean of Westminster, Corresponding Member of the Institute of France." London: John Murray; New York: Scribner, Armstrong & Co. 1872.

ed space at his command, he at last approaches his subject, he pours forth throughout the remainder of the book a mass of anecdotes which are always interesting and frequently amusing, and a mass of reflections which, if never profound, are often striking. Of Scott, of Erskine, of Burns, of David Hume, of Dean Stanley's personal friends, we hear a good deal (and indeed of the friends perhaps a little too much); but of the history of the Church of Scotland, of its growth and development, of the dogmas for which it fought, of its triumphs and defeats, of its numerous disruptions, and of the causes from which they arose, we hear from next to nothing, and any student unfortunate enough to purchase the book hoping to find therein such a sketch of Scotch ecclesiastical history as, for example, Mr. Freeman has given of the English Constitution, would no doubt feel that he had utterly wasted his money, and wonder how a man so able as Dean Stanley could have thought it worth while to use so much ingenuity in avoiding the subject on which he professed to lecture.

But though it would be very natural for the purchaser of a work entitled "The Church of Scotland" to fancy, after reading the Dean of Westminster's production, that the author had, from some inscrutable cause, utterly failed in telling the history he had undertaken to narrate, such an idea would be in truth without foundation. Dean Stanley is, above all things, a skilful writer, and has produced exactly the work which he always intended to produce. As a history the book is without value, simply because the author never intended to write a history. As a rhetorical essay, of which the Church of Scotland is the text, but of which the views of English Broad Churchmen are the theme, the lectures are as artfully written a composition as any one need wish to read. "I appear before you," says the author at the commencement of his first lecture, "as the representative of a prelatical hierarchy, as an *Erastian of the Erastians*." "I come before you," in other words he might have said, "to show you how the history of the Scotch Church confirms the truth of the views held by Broad Churchmen. To do this I shall occasionally refer to the history of your church; but an indirect defence of certain political and theological doctrines is the real object of my address, and to the attainment of this object, and not to the narration of history, my lectures will be directed." It is almost a pity that some distinct statement of this sort was not made, for, by setting forth the real aim of the lectures, it would, we suspect, have saved them from a good deal of irrelevant criticism. Looked at, at any rate, as a rhetorical essay in favor of the opinions now prevailing among liberal churchmen, they exhibit in the strongest light the strong and weak points of the Dean of Westminster and of the party to which he belongs. Of the position of his party we have in this article nothing to say; our object is to point out some of Dean Stanley's merits and deserts as a rhetorician.

He nowhere throughout the work states what precisely are the principles which it is his object to defend, and in this omission follows a perfectly sound rhetorical instinct; but a careful reader soon perceives that the Dean is bent upon maintaining, or rather upon enforcing, two doctrines which may be described as the fundamentals of the Broad Churchman's creed. The first is the supreme advantage of maintaining a church establishment kept up and ruled by the state. The second is the unimportance of theological dogmas, at any rate, as compared with what, for want of a better term, may be called religious morality. Now, at first sight, a Scotch lecture-room seems about the last place any man would choose for propounding these doctrines, for the two most marked features of Scotch ecclesiastical sentiment have been a rooted dislike to any control of the church by the state, and a rooted belief in the supreme importance in certain very definite, very stern, and, as opponents would say, very narrow theological dogmas. Dean Stanley, of course, well knew the difficulties of his position, and probably a temptation to deliver the lectures was a keen sense of the humor involved in making Scotland bear witness to the truth of Erastianism. Whatever judgment one may form of the ultimate success attending Dean Stanley's efforts, no one can read his book without a feeling of amused admiration at the skill with which he avails himself of every point in his favor, and contrives, whilst virtually contradicting every principle for the sake of which the Scotch Church has existed, to enlist in favor of his argument various sentiments and prejudices likely to exist in a Scotch audience.

The subject of the connection of church and state is approached with some caution. The first lecture forms a sort of prelude to the discourses which follow. It is, among other things, an attempt to hint rather than show that the Scotch Church is not a body created by the Reformation, but in some sense the representative of the earliest national ecclesiastical establishment. When the Dean has accustomed his hearers to look on an established church as a thing to which Scotland had always been accustomed, he then proceeds a step further to point out that on the subject of establishments the modern Broad Church and the Scotch Church had always been at one "Many of the Scottish sects," he writes, "have in later times drifted

into the doctrine of an imaginary separation between church and state. Nothing can be more unjust to themselves or more untrue to history. Their independence is as secular, as political, as national, as ever was the compliance of the most latitudinarian of Erastians." Now the point in which we most admire the Dean's art is that he has here found a point of sympathy between himself and the founders of the Scotch Church. These reformers, like all the reformers of their age, no doubt held that the church and state ought to be one, and it is also perfectly true that in Scotland "each separate communion maintained that it and it alone was the true Church of Scotland." The Dean, therefore, and John Knox, and John Knox's successors may each, argues the lecturer, in substance be considered as holding the same view of church government, because they are, each and all, opposed to modern voluntaryism. "English nonconformists," he adds, to clinch the matter, "pride themselves on their nonconformity, but Scotch nonconformists pride themselves on their churchmanship." The unimportant fact which he omits to notice is that Scotch reformers and their followers held that the church should rule the state, whilst Dean Stanley and his friends mean that the state should rule the church. However, by omitting this trifling circumstance and by hinting not obscurely that at the disruption of 1843 good men made themselves martyrs by mistake, and a suggestion that the disruption itself was caused by Christian men misunderstanding the effect of an obscure law point, he certainly leaves the impression that a keen sympathy in the union of church and state makes a bond between Scotch Covenanters and English Broad Churchmen, who are only divided on this matter by something hardly more serious than a misunderstanding.

He, however, relies comparatively little on general arguments. His real defence of the Established Church of Scotland is one which, though not easily put in an argumentative form, is practically very effective; and lies in the description and eulogy of the numerous great men who have formed part of that church. The learning of Blair, the statesmanship of Carstairs, the genius of Burns, the fame of Scott, are all indirectly but none the less effectively brought forward to the glory of the Established Church. In the third lecture, Dean Stanley reaches what is really the culminating point of this part of his argument. That lecture is an elaborate eulogy of the "Moderates" of the last century; a party in whose tolerance, liberality, learning, and, we fear we must add, want of religious enthusiasm, can no doubt be traced a strong likeness to the ecclesiastical liberals of modern days. "Not till quite our own generation have poetry, philosophy, and history found so natural a home in the clergy of England as they did then in the clergy of Scotland. Robert Watson, the historian of Philip II.; Adam Ferguson, the historian of Rome; John Home, the author of the tragedy of 'Douglas'; Hugh Blair, the author of the celebrated sermons and the lectures on rhetoric; and, lastly and chiefly, William Robertson, the historian of Scotland, America, and Charles V., were all ministers of the Church of Scotland." By the time the speaker had conducted his audience to the point at which they and he could both thoroughly sympathize in the eulogy of that branch of the Scotch clergy who probably most nearly resembled the clergy of the English Establishment, Dean Stanley for the moment, at least, achieved his first great rhetorical triumph, and worked his audience up to the feeling that to have had an establishment had been, is, and would be the great blessing of Scotland.

The recommendation of the Dean's first thesis was, however, a comparatively easy matter, for he had this circumstance in his favor, that the history of the Scotch Church lends no more countenance to voluntaryism than does the history of the Church of England. The much more difficult and important achievement was to persuade Scotchmen to entertain at least the idea that dogmas might be altogether unimportant.

FREEMAN'S NORMAN CONQUEST.*

THERE seems to be some fatality upon historians who publish by instalments, which brings to naught all their calculations as to the compass of their works, so that they either make more volumes than they planned, like Mr. Baucroft, or stop at an earlier date than they intended, like Mr. Froude, or swell their later volumes out of all proportion. This last is what Mr. Freeman is doing. His volumes have steadily increased in bulk from 650 pages to 827; and the next volume, one would think, must be the thickest of all, for he has reserved for it a great deal of matter which was designed for the present one, but shut out for want of room. Probably the truth is that every zealous student finds his work grow upon his hands as he becomes more at home in it; and events which had seemed of trifling importance

* "The History of the Norman Conquest of England, its Causes and its Results. By Edward A. Freeman, M.A., Hon. D.C.L., late Fellow of Trinity College." Vol. IV. The Reign of William the Conqueror. New York: Macmillan & Co. 8vo, pp. 827.

now appear in his eyes so characteristic and instructive that he cannot bring himself to pass them cursorily over. Of course, in one sense this is just. The most commonplace incidents have a high value when the period is distant and our information scanty, because of the occasional and incidental light they throw upon the life of the time. But we need only a moderate amount of this; more than enough is wearying. So with the personalities whom Mr. Freeman brings before us. He can hardly place Lanfranc and William Fitz Osborn too vividly before our eyes; but many names pass like the kings of Banquo's race, and are named and described only to be forgotten.

The present volume is superior to any other in smoothness and evenness of style, and is inferior to none in sustained interest. There are some most graphic passages—for instance, the account of the death and funeral of the Conqueror is a remarkable piece of narration. After all, however, the volume is too large. It contains detail which can be skipped without the least interfering with one's enjoyment or understanding, and which, if read, cannot possibly be remembered—matter which belongs to the chronicler rather than the historian, and which really throws no light on the character of the time. The chief reason why we object to this fulness of detail is that it makes it necessary to omit some matter that one naturally looks for in these pages. Not only is the whole subject of the social condition of England, as affected by the Conquest, left for the next volume, but the treatment of contemporary European events and international relations is far less satisfactory than one would expect from Mr. Freeman.

The special point in which Mr. Freeman is pre-eminent as a historian is his power of presenting the age of which he treats vividly and distinctly before the eye; the personality of the leading characters, the actual working of the institutions, and the exact territorial relations. He is an earnest believer in the importance and efficacy of these things, as well as an unusually accurate student in their details. His aim is to present the age as it knew itself, so that the reader shall see it as an intelligent contemporary would have seen it; or, if this is not a conscious aim, it is, at all events, the result accomplished; and one is disposed to welcome his pure objectiveness as a reaction from the excessive disposition of some writers in late years to assign historical events to *general* causes almost exclusively, disregarding the influence of personal character and special circumstances. Mr. Freeman does not strive after picturesqueness; his aim is, first and last, accuracy—a quality which is apt to be neglected when picturesqueness is the chief thing. But he is the master of a vivid, animated style, and has a generally excellent judgment as to the relative importance of facts, joined with that invaluable faculty of investing the dullest statistics with a certain liveliness and instructiveness which results from this very practice of pointing out their practical bearing, and their relations to everyday affairs. Now, seeing that his chief merit is in presenting an epoch with great life and distinctness before his readers, it seems a pity that in the important period covered by this volume he has been obliged to omit or slight certain points of the greatest value in such a view, and thus make the view somewhat incomplete.

So far as it goes, however, the view is very distinct, and complete to a certain point. The subject of the present volume is, strictly speaking, the conquest of the island; for it is shown that the battle of Hastings was only the first step to this, or rather, perhaps, only made it possible. The gradual steps of the conquest, its thoroughness, and the influence of this upon the unity of the kingdom, are made very clear, especially by the aid of a map, which shows, by colored lines, its successive steps. A map like this is, he says, "as far as I know, a new attempt." The plans of the chief cities as they existed at this epoch are also an original and most serviceable feature. By the careful narrative it is demonstrated that England was very far from being subdued by the one battle; and it seems to have been only the lack of a competent leader of the English that made a complete conquest possible. Mr. Freeman emphasizes, however, the important fact that William was now, by whatever means, the legitimate King of England, formally elected, and duly consecrated; so that all future resistance was, in point of law, rebellion against the legitimate authority, not resistance to an armed invader. To get the letter of the law on his side was the first and greatest step in the conquest after the victory which gave him a foothold in the land.

In his subsequent actions, in the gradual subjugation of the kingdom, nothing is more striking than the slow and solid progress of each year, the thoroughness with which each new acquisition was made fast, and especially the sagacity with which the tenure of land was made an instrument of policy. William knew just how much of feudalism would serve his purpose, and how essential it was in a permanent conquest to strike root deep in the soil. Here his policy reminds one strongly of the conquests of the Roman republic. The Norman fortresses, at every important point, were like the Roman military colonies in their strategic importance; yet the Roman colonies were not merely military posts, but were at the same time an occu-

pation of the land by actual settlers, who continued likewise to preserve a share at least of Roman citizenship. Now, this most original characteristic of the Roman system was, to be sure, not made use of in the Norman military posts themselves; but the same result was reached by means of land-grants. The Roman military posts were colonies, the members of which still continued *municipes* of the mother city. William, instead of colonies, used fiefs; but both institutions, however widely differing in other respects, were alike in this—that the immediate occupant of the soil was the representative and soldier of the sovereign.

Connected with this policy, and not less remarkable in point of sagacity and efficiency, is the vigor with which William "conquered the tendencies to anarchy and division which lurked both in the old institutions of the land and in the new institutions which he had himself brought in and fostered" (p. 696). In laying the foundations of a developed feudalism, he took care not only to arrest the tendencies to disintegration in England itself, which, after all, were one of the chief causes of his success, but, still more, those which existed in continental feudalism. Polydore Vergil, an Italian, who resided in England in the sixteenth century, remarks as a peculiarity of the country that "by reason of an ancient custom in England, dukes and earls have their titles of dignities of the counties, within the which oftentimes they have no possessions nor patrimonies; but their revenue consisteth of lands and possessions which they have elsewhere." Now, it was William the Conqueror that laid the foundation for this by taking care that his tenants-in-chief should hold detached fiefs scattered in all counties rather than large stretches of contiguous territory—a policy precisely analogous to that by which the ten tribes of Cilicia were made up of non-adjacent demes. Moreover, not only was he careful that the properties of his earls and barons should not be compact territories, but, as governors of shires, they were not invested with such powers as their peers on the Continent. Only in three exceptionally-situated counties—Chester, Durham, and Kent (two of them ruled by ecclesiastics)—were palatine powers conferred. It was to this subordination of the great feudatories, and the fact that the king was in reality as well as in name at the head of the feudal hierarchy, that England owes at once her unity and, in a great degree, her healthy and steady development of constitutional liberty.

Another important point which is made prominent by Mr. Freeman is the continuousness of English institutions under the rule of the Conqueror, a view, it will be remembered, very characteristic of him, and which, therefore, it would be expected that this volume would take pains to make clear. For example, the succession of the three annual *gemots*, at Gloucester, Winchester, and Westminster, was kept up as in former reigns, and made use of by the king for carrying out his policy—just as the Tudors used parliament as their regular instrument. See also particularly (p. 364) the account of the Shire-gemot of Kent in relation to the Peneudon controversy. The great formal change made in this reign—most characteristic for a contemporary of Gregory VII.—was the removal of ecclesiastical affairs from the control of the *Witena-gemot*. Mr. Freeman is careful, however, to point out the degree of independence still enjoyed by the English Church, even in the Pontificate of Gregory. When the Pope sent to him, demanding "that the King of the English should profess himself the man of the Bishop of Rome," William quietly replied that this fealty "he had never promised, and his predecessors had never paid" (p. 432). So we find quoted (p. 347) the expression of Pope Urbau, calling Archbishop Anselm "quasi alterius orbis papam."

Of special points of interest we will mention the description of the municipalities of Exeter (p. 157) and Lincoln (p. 202), with the strong tendencies that existed to develop both into free republics like Lübeck and Florence. We wish there were more of this, but shall probably find it in the next volume. The frequent use of Domesday Book as collateral authority often suggests interesting points of detail, as, for instance (p. 805), where it is shown that the hero Hereward was a laudholder not only in Lincolnshire, but probably also in Warwickshire and Worcestershire. A particularly interesting and instructive point is (p. 624) as to the existence in England of English and Norman law side by side, according to the nationality of the parties. "In England this reference [to the judgment of God] took the form of the ordeal of water or of hot iron, while in Normandy it took the form of wager of battle. William recognized both modes of trial." It is interesting, too, to a reader of Scott, to find an ancestor of Peveril of the Peak (p. 201) holding lands both in Nottinghamshire and in the Peakland of Derbyshire.

Mr. Freeman may be an example to all historians in the care that he takes to instruct his readers; not only in giving authority for his statements—for all good historians do that—or in arguing special points in appendices, for this, too, is not uncommon, but in giving an opportunity to compare his own expressions by numerous cross-references to his own volumes. These are most serviceable, especially in a work which comes out a volume at a time; but we know no other historian who gives them as abundantly and

systematically. Maps, too, as we have already indicated, are a strong point in all his works. We anticipate in his next volume important results from the combination of his minute and accurate investigation with his habit of giving the reader the means of weighing every detail of argument, and comprehending every point of illustration. The transition from the Anglo-Saxon system to pure feudalism will be a subject well adapted to his highest powers.

Journal d'un Diplomate en Italie. Notes intimes pour servir à l'histoire du Second Empire. Par Henri d'Iderville. Turin, 1859-62. (New York: F. W. Christen.)—This volume is to be followed by a second, treating of the author's stay in Rome (1852-66), and a third, divided between Athens (1867) and Dresden (1868). It will be seen from these dates that the author was fortunately situated for observation during the important decade which his journal covers, having witnessed in Italy the complete emancipation of the country from Austria; the Garibaldian conquest of Southern Italy; Castelfidardo and Aspromonte; and having been in Greece at a time when French diplomacy, which more perhaps than anything else had precipitated the Cretan insurrection in 1860, offered almost no hindrance to its disastrous conclusion; finally, having served in Germany in the pregnant interval between Sadowa and Sedan—perhaps with as little insight and foresight as his colleagues, Baron Stoffel excepted, and with as little usefulness to his Imperial employer and to his unhappy country. He himself remarks that, "in the latter years of the Empire, the traditions to which French diplomacy owed the influence it formerly exerted abroad, and which refused admission to the incapable and unworthy, had completely disappeared." The ambitious personage in whom this deterioration seems to have reached its lowest pitch, M. Vincent Benedetti, is described by his unwilling associate in no flattering terms, though Count d'Iderville ranks him far above "those secondary personages." MM. Rouher and Haussmann, whose character, he says, is if possible inferior to their abilities. He appears on the scene in March, 1861, as an officious intermeddler in the treaty ceding Nice and Savoy to France, having got himself appointed second plenipotentiary. Shortly after his arrival in Turin, being in the diplomatic gallery when some member of the Parliament makes an incidental allusion to France, he has the impudence to ejaculate audibly: "If they go on talking like that, I shall have to interfere." Later we find him a vehement partisan of the radical policy of the Roman question, intriguing with Rattazzi, opposed to Ricasoli. Of each of these statesmen we have interesting delineations, especially on the conjugal side. The author on one occasion was, together with an Italian deputy and the senator Cibrario, used by Mme. de Solms to prevent a solitary interview with Rattazzi, not yet minister, but already her lover, and destined to marry her a fortnight after she became a widow. As for Ricasoli, his wife not having been above suspicion, he kept her closely secluded till her death at his chateau between Florence and Siena. Cavour is of course the principal figure in these memoirs, our diplomat confessing to a warm attachment for him. His simple mode of life, his subordination in his domestic relations to his elder brother, his passion for farming, his unostentatious appearance in the streets—he almost never used a carriage—the untiring industry which finally killed him; this and the public grief over "Papa Camille" are well expressed in Count d'Iderville's notes. One whole chapter is mainly a translation of reminiscences of Cavour that appeared in *Pasquino*, the comic paper of Turin, for once serious and mournful like the rest. When Parliament met to receive the news of his death, and the ministers had entered, all eyes were turned to the premier's empty seat, and from there, by a singular absence of mind, to the door, as if he were still expected. An anecdote is told of him which should be good reading at the American legation in London: how that, the Austrian Minister of Foreign Affairs having, as a mark of friendship, reserved for him a thousand shares in the Austrian railways, which had just been conceded to a French company, making the investment a very safe and valuable one, Cavour replied: "I thank your Excellency for your offer, but since I have become minister I have renounced all speculation."

We pass over the glimpses of social life in Piedmont, whose sturdy inhabitants—"the muscles of Italy"—treated the French almost as compatriots, though after Villa France they filled their print-shops with portraits of Orsini, and exposed revolutionary pamphlets on the stalls; of the Milanese Anglomania; of the Parmese poverty, such that "when the Duchess wished to give an entertainment or a ball, she was obliged, in order to have ladies for the dance, to import from Paris gowns, head-dresses, etc., and distribute them among the notables of the place." Nor can we stop long with Lamarmora, Cialdini, or Garibaldi, taking his seat as a deputy and forgetting himself in the middle of his set speech; with the Comtesse de Castiglione; with Dumas, contracting with the Government to write from the secret archives a history of the House of Bourbon at Naples; with Victor

Emanuel, even, though he merits a few words. The king's traits are drawn with respectful freedom, and his good qualities—courage and a capacity for tenderness and delicacy of feeling—not overlooked. Though not beautiful, says d'Iderville, he is savage and picturesque, and not without grandeur—"un roi hun, un chef barbare." His morganatic connection with the Countess Millefiori is set forth without censure. Most amusing are the illustrations of his detestation of ceremonies, and especially dinners, he himself eating but once a day. On the opening of the railway from Bologna to Ancona, he took passage with his suite and the diplomatic corps, and alighted at Rimini, the half-way station, for refreshments, the time allowed being three-quarters of an hour. Disdaining to eat, he endured the halt for about six minutes, and then abruptly ordered the train to proceed, to the dismay of the invited guests, who had scarcely begun to satisfy their hunger. A general pillage of the feast ensued, in which the king's lackeys played a conspicuous part, getting well intoxicated before they arrived at Ancona.

We must close with an extract or two, serving to compare 1861 with 1871. The bitter pill of "compensation," which cost the new kingdom Savoy and Nice, was coated over by a substitution of "reunion" in the treaty, in place of the words "annexation" and "cession." Napoleon himself, in a letter to Persigny, dated July 29, 1860, speaks of his desire "to see *reunited* to France provinces essentially French." When the treaty was submitted to the Italian Parliament for ratification, certain of the deputies from the ceded provinces spoke for the last time, "using, as was their wont, the French language, whereas they were replied to in Italian." Finally, says d'Iderville, "the comedy of universal suffrage ended, as usual, to the entire satisfaction of the author and the actors." The bearing of this precedent on the annexation of Alsace and Lorraine is too obvious to require comment. "The French character is always the same," says the diplomatist, telling of the rude and disorderly behavior of some of Lamoricière's troops who had been taken prisoners at Castelfidardo and sent to Turin, where they were granted a large degree of liberty. "Cavour sent for me: 'I allow your youngsters their freedom,' said he, 'but for Heaven's sake don't let them insult us because they were beaten.'"

Our Poor Relations: A philezoic essay. By Colonel E. B. Hamley. With illustrations, chiefly by Ernest Griset. American edition. (Boston: J. E. Tilton & Co.)—Every *ism* is entitled to its light literature, so we must patiently await the coming of the host of flimsy child-books and trashy novels which are to popularize the new gospel of philezoism, altruism, or whatever the theory is to be named which is the motive of our societies for the prevention of cruelty to animals. It may well offend the souls of those who are striving to embody in our society the spirit of the great moral as well as physical discovery that the brute is our neighbor and kinsman, to see, as they must, how nothing is sacred to the book-maker, nothing beyond the reach of the modern masters of namby-pamby. If we accept the spirit of the age, and regard every question as entitled to its share of fine writing and baby-talk, we can find something interesting in this book of Colonel Hamley's. It always marks a considerable success in any reform when half-pay colonels of Pall Mall clubs take it up. It is evident, however, that it is not in the spirit of the reformer, but of the dilettante, that the author has written. If there be any purpose in his work beyond the indulgence of a considerable power for stringing small stories together, it is to abuse professional naturalists.

The pictures which illustrate this "essay" are poor in execution and overstrained. Griset has failed in giving a pathetic look to animals, which seems to be primarily a German knack, though some English pencils have acquired it.

Authors.—Titles.	BOOKS OF THE WEEK.	Publishers.—Prices.
Robinson (F. W.), A Bridge of Glass, swd.....		(Harper & Bros.)
Sharp (J. C.), Studies in Poetry and Philosophy.....		(Hurd & Houghton) 1 50
Saxe (J. G.), Fables and Legends of Many Countries.....		(J. R. Osgood & Co.) 1 50
Sewards (S. D.), Registration of Written Instruments, swd; Baker, Voorhis & Co.) 0 50		
Stewart (Prof. B.), Physics (Science Primer).....		(D. Appleton & Co.)
Spargeon (Rev. C. H.), Sermons, 9th Series.....		(Sheldon & Co.)
Swinton (W.), First Lessons in our Country's History, (Ivison, Blakeman & Co.) 0 80		
Schellen, Roscoe, and Huggins (Profes.) Spectrum Analysis Explained, swd.....		(Lee & Shepard) 0 25
Thackeray (W. M.), Paris Sketch Book; Irish Sketch Book, 1 vol.....		
		(J. B. Lippincott & Co.)
The House of Yorke: A Tale.....		(Cath. Pub. Soc.) 2 50
The Workshop, No. 4, swd.....		(E. Steiger) 0 40
Trafton (Adeline), An American Girl Abroad.....		(Lee & Shepard)
Townsend (Rev. L. T.), God-Man.....		"
Tyerman (Rev. L.), Life and Times of John Wesley, Vol. III.....		(Harper & Bros.)
Ticknor (G.), History of Spanish Literature, 3 Vols., new ed. (J. R. Osgood & Co.)		
The Minor Poems of Homer.....		(A. Denham & Co.) 1 50
Tears (E. H.), The Fourth Gospel the Heart of Christ.....		(Noyes, Holmes & Co.)
Wedgwood (H.), Dictionary of English Etymology, 2d ed.		(Macmillan & Co.) 8 00
Wilson (H.), Rise and Fall of the Slave Power in America, Vol. I.....		(J. R. Osgood & Co.)
Zeitschrift für Erdkunde, No. 36, swd.....		(L. W. Schmidt)

THE WORKS OF W. D. HOWELLS.

New and enlarged edition. "Venetian Life," 1 vol., 12mo, \$2; "Italian Journeys," 1 vol. 12mo, \$2; "Suburban Sketches," 1 vol. 12mo, illustrated, \$2.

These unique and delightful works of Mr. Howells, which have won great favor in Europe and America by their humor, fine observation, and unsurpassed grace, are now published in enlarged editions. "Suburban Sketches" contains "Some Lessons in the School of Morals," not included in previous issues; it is rendered yet more attractive by the addition of several illustrations. "Italian Journeys" embraces an important chapter on "Ducal Mantua," which describes a visit to the old city in the last year of the Austrian rule, and is also a monograph upon her history from the earliest times, bringing into relief the picturesque and romantic incidents in which it abounds, and sketching her social and political aspects under the Republican chiefs, the lords, marquises, and dukes. It presents a completer view of Mantuan history than exists elsewhere in English, and is drawn from sources little known outside of Italy. A new chapter has been added to "Venetian Life," entitled "Our Last Year in Venice." It sums up the impressions of previous years, and completes the record of the author's residence in Venice, while it touches upon aspects and traits of the city not treated in other chapters of the book.

THACKERAY'S WORKS.

Kensington Edition. Illustrated. "Vanity Fair," 1 vol. 8vo, \$2; "The History of Pendennis," 1 vol. 8vo, \$2.

The first and second volumes of an entirely new edition of the great novelist's writings, to include his Novels and Miscellanies, newly arranged, in 12 elegant, large-type, tastefully-bound volumes. The most desirable library edition of Thackeray.

OLRIG GRANGE.

A Story in Verse. 16mo, \$1.50.

"'Olrig Grange' is plainly the work of a ripe student of life and nature. It has dramatic power of a quite uncommon class; satirical and humorous observation of a class still higher; a graceful and ingenuous turn in playing that game of speculation with the data of modern thought which always makes a book stimulating for the modern mind to read; and, finally, a very pure and healthy moral atmosphere. The social insight and epigram of the little poem would have furnished forth several ordinary novels, had they been turned to that service."—*Pall Mall Gazette*.

PANSIES. A Volume of Poems.

By Mrs. A. D. T. Whitney, author of "Leslie Goldthwaite," "We Girls," "Real Folks," etc. 1 vol. 16mo, \$1.50.

This book contains poems of Occasion, of Suggestion, of Interpretation and Hope. They possess in eminent degree the qualities which have made Mrs. Whitney's stories exceptionally popular among the most intelligent readers. The purity, sweetness, shrewdness, tenderness, humor, the elevated and cheerful religious faith, which find expression in her writings, endear her to all who know them.

A DICTIONARY OF AMERICAN BIOGRAPHY.

By Francis S. Drake. 1 vol. large 8vo, cloth, \$6; sheep, \$7; half calf or half morocco, \$8.50; full calf, \$10; full morocco, \$12.

"Its comprehensiveness appears in the fact that it contains nearly ten thousand notices of persons of both sexes, of native and foreign birth, who have been remarkable or prominently connected with the arts, sciences, literature, politics, or history of the American continent. To this fulness has been added the correct pronunciation of many peculiar names, and the assumed names of many writers. These excellences of arrangement, however, would be comparatively of little worth but for higher essential excellences of other kinds; and in regard to the latter emphatic words of commendation are to be applied to this production, truly 'continental in its scope.' It will be seen, therefore, that this dictionary may be spoken of as the dictionary, so far as Americans of note, dead or now living, are concerned, and to be regarded as an authority."—*Boston Transcript*.

For sale by all Booksellers. Sent, post-paid, on receipt of price by the Publishers.

JAMES R. OSGOOD & CO., Boston.

JUST ISSUED.
THE JUNE NUMBER OF
LIPPINCOTT'S MAGAZINE.
AN ILLUSTRATED MONTHLY OF
POPULAR LITERATURE AND SCIENCE.

CONTENTS.

1. SCRAMBLES AMONGST THE ALPS during the Years 1860-69. A Series of Graphic and Brilliant Sketches. By Edward Whymper. Profusely and exquisitely illustrated after the unrivaled Drawings of the Author. Chapters XIX.-XXII. (Conclusion.)
2. CONSTANTINOPLE. By Rev. F. W. Holland. Illustrated.
3. ALWAYS. A Florida Lyric. By W. W. Harney.
4. THE STRANGE ADVENTURES OF A PHAETON. A Serial Novel. By William Black, author of "A Daughter of Heth." Chapters XIII.-XV.
5. PIERRE RONSARD. By Kate Hillard.
6. A DRAFT ON THE BANK OF SPAIN. A Story.
7. THE GREAT IDEA. By the Hon. Charles K. Tuckerman.
8. AYTOON. A Serial Novel. Chaps. XI. and XII. (Conclusion.)
9. PRIVATE ART COLLECTIONS OF PHILADELPHIA. By E. S. 3. Mr. Samuel B. Fales's Collection.
10. CARCASSONNE. From the French of Gustave Nadand. By John R. Thompson.
11. LONDON CLUBS. By Reginald Wynford.
12. OUR MONTHLY GOSSIP: Through Hell's Glen to Inverary; Thackeray as a Showman, etc.
13. LITERATURE OF THE DAY.

For sale by all Book and News Dealers.
TERMS.—Yearly Subscription, \$4. Single Number, 35 cents. Specimen Number mailed, postage paid, to any address, on receipt of 25 cents.

J. B. LIPPINCOTT & CO., Publishers,
715 and 717 Market Street, Philadelphia.

GEORGE ROUTLEDGE & SONS

LIST OF

RECENT PUBLICATIONS OF INTEREST.

I.

FLOWERS AND GARDENS: Notes on Plant Beauty. By a Medical Man. 12mo, extra cloth, \$2.50.

II.

THE BOOK OF MODERN SCOTCH: Anecdotes: Humor, Wit, and Wisdom. Edited by James Allan Mair. 16mo, boards, price 50 cents.

"Argument for a week, laughter for a month, and a good jest for ever."

III.

MUSIC AND MORALS. By the Rev. H. R. Haweis, M.A. With facsimiles and diagrams.

Beautifully printed and emblematically bound. 12mo, cloth, price \$3.

IV.

WALKS IN ROME.

By Augustus T. C. Hare. Second American edition. 12mo, extra cloth, price \$3.50.

For sale by all booksellers, or will be mailed, post-paid, to any address, on receipt of price by the publishers.

GEORGE ROUTLEDGE & SONS,

416 Broome Street, New York.

LONDON BOOKS.

PRICED AND DESCRIPTIVE CATALOGUE, NO. 32,

OF

RARE, STANDARD, AND VALUABLE ENGLISH AND FOREIGN BOOKS,

which we offer at

LOW PRICES,

just published, and will be sent free of charge to any address.

A. DENHAM & CO., Importers and Publishers,
17 Murray Street (near Broadway), New York.

For Special Notices see page iii.

MACMILLAN & CO.'S

NEW BOOKS.

ESSAYS AND LECTURES ON POLITICAL and Social Subjects. By Prof. Fawcett, M.P., and Millicent Garrett Fawcett. 8vo, \$3.50.

Contents: Modern Socialism—Free Education in its Economic Aspects—Regulation of Hours of Labor by the State—National Debts and National Prosperity—Education of Women—Why Women require the Suffrage, etc.

THE GROWTH OF THE ENGLISH CONSTITUTION from the Earliest Times. By Edward A. Freeman, D.C.L. Crown 8vo, cloth, \$2.

NEW WORKS, by the late Rev. Frederick Denison Maurice, M.A., Prof. of Moral Philosophy in the University of Cambridge.

MORAL AND METAPHYSICAL PHILOSOPHY. New edition. With Preface. 2 vols. 8vo, \$9.

SOCIAL MORALITY. Twenty-one Lectures. 8vo, cloth, \$4.50.

THE CONSCIENCE. Lectures on Casuistry, 2d edition. Crown 8vo, \$1.75.

THEOLOGICAL ESSAYS. 3d Edition. Crown 8vo, \$3.

THE PROPHETS AND KINGS OF THE OLD TESTAMENT. 3d edition. Crown 8vo, \$3.

THE PATRIARCHS AND LAWGIVERS OF the Old Testament. 3d edition. 12mo, \$2.

THE RELIGIONS OF THE WORLD AND their Relations to Christianity. 4th edition. 12mo, \$1.50.

THE GOSPEL OF THE KINGDOM OF Heaven. A Series of Lectures on the Gospel of St. Luke. Crown 8vo, \$2.

THE GROUND AND OBJECT OF HOPE FOR Mankind. Four Sermons. Crown 8vo, \$1.

THE COMMANDMENTS CONSIDERED AS Instruments of National Reformation. Crown 8vo, \$1.25.

DIALOGUES ON FAMILY WORSHIP. \$1.50.

New Edition, crown 8vo, \$1.50.

THE WITNESS OF HISTORY TO CHRIST. Being the Hulsean Lectures for 1870. By Rev. F. W. Farrar, M.A., F.R.S., Head Master of Marlborough College.

EDWIN WILKINS FIELD. A Memorial Sketch by Dr. Sadler. With an Address delivered in the Hall of the Incorporated Law Society by Sir Roundell Palmer. Crown 8vo, cloth, \$1.75.

HISTORICAL OUTLINES OF ENGLISH ACCIDENT. Comprising Chapters on the History and Development of the Language, and on Word-Formation. By the Rev. Richard Morris, LL.D. 12mo, cloth, price \$1.75.

AN INTRODUCTION TO GREEK AND LATIN ETYMOLOGY. By John Peile, M.A. 2d edition. Crown 8vo, cloth, \$3.50.

THE CLARENDON PRESS SERIES.

SPECIMENS OF EARLY ENGLISH: a New and Revised Edition, with Introduction, Notes, and Glossarial Index. By the Rev. Richard Morris, LL.D., and the Rev. Walter W. Skeat, M.A. Part 2. From Robert of Gloucester to Gower, A.D. 1298—A.D. 1393. 12mo, \$3.

SPECIMENS OF ENGLISH LITERATURE. From the "Ploughman's Crede" to the "Shepheardes Calender," A.D. 1394—A.D. 1579. With Introduction, Notes, and Glossarial Index. By the Rev. Walter W. Skeat, M.A. 12mo, \$3.

THE PHILOLOGY OF THE ENGLISH TONGUE. By John Earle, M.A. 12mo, \$2.

POPE. Satires and Epistles. Edited by Mark Pattison, B.D. 12mo, 75 cents.

MACMILLAN & CO.,

38 Bleecker Street, New York.

